A Second

COLLECTION

OF

TRACTS,

PROVING

The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the only True God;

And Jesus Christ the Son of God, him whom the Father sanctified and sent, raised from the Dead and exalted.

And disproving

The Doctrine of Three Almighty and Equal Persons, Spirits, Modes, Subsistences, or Somewhats in God; and of the Incarnation.

Of which Tracts, the following Pages give the Titles.

1 Tim. 2. 5. *For* there is *one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus.*

(1693)

The TITLES of the several TRACTS.

The

The Titles of the several Tracts.

A *Letter of Resolution concerning the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation; giving the general Reasons of the Unitarians against those Doctrines.* In 19 Pages.

Two Letters touching the Trinity and Incarnation: The first urges the Belief of the Athanasian Creed; the other is an Answer thereto. In 15 Pages.

An accurate Examination of the principal Texts usually alledged for the Divinity of our Saviour, and for the Satisfaction, &c. occasioned by a Book of Mr. L. Milbourn, *called,* Mysteries (in Religion) vindicated. In 59 Pages.

Reflections on two Discourses concerning the Divinity of our Saviour; written by Monsieur Lamothe *in French, and done into English.* In 24 Pages.

The Trinitarian Scheme of Religion, concerning Almighty God, and Mankind, consider'd both before and after the Fall; *with Notes thereupon: which Notes contain also the Unitarian Scheme.* In 28 Pages.

Of worshipping the Holy Ghost expresly, as a Person equal to, and distinct from the Father. In 12 Pages.

The Unreasonableness of the Doctrine of the Trinity, briefly demonstrated. In 12 Pages.

The

2/6

The Titles of the several Tracts.

The Belief of the Athanasian Creed not required by the Church of England, as necessary to Salvation. In 4 Pages.

Mr. Chillingworth's *Judgment of the Religion of Protestants; of Scripture the only Rule; of Differences among Protestants; of using Force in Matters of Religion, &c.* In 8 Pages.

Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity, by Dr. Wallis, *Dr.* Sherlock, *Dr.* S—th, *Dr.* Cudworth, *and Mr.* Hooker; *as also on the Account given by those that say, The Trinity is an unconceivable and inexplicable Mystery.* In 35 Pages.

A Letter of Resolution concerning the Doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation.

YOU have pleased, Sir, to demand of me the *Grounds*, *Reasons*, which the *Unitarians*, (or as others now call us, the *Socinians*,) have separated from the *Catholick* Doctrines of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*: in which all other Sects and Denominations of Christians do agree; and contend also for them as *Fundamental* Doctrines?

'Tis true, Sir, that we are alone, in our Belief or Opinion of but one GOD, or (when is the same) *but one who is GOD*, even the GOD and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: And as we are alone, so we are a *little Flock*: If our Reasons were no more considerable than our Number, we should be very contemptible to our Opposers. The Case was once otherwise; there is no Ecclesiastical Historian but has noted the time, when *All the World went against Athanasius, and* Athanasius *against all the World*. But it avails very little, that we can say, *Fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium*. And that which you have demanded of me, is, *What are our Reasons*; not how it has come to pass (or by what Persecutions) we have been reduced to so small a Number?

I answer therefore; Our *first Reason* is,

'The Doctrines of the Trinity and Incar-'nation, have no solid or good Foundation 'in *Revelation*, or Holy Scripture.

A Stranger in this Controversy, who hears the Sermons or reads the Books of some of our Opposers, would think, that the Question between us and the Trinitarians is on their side as clear in Revelation, as 'tis confess'd to be on ours in Point of Reason: for this is the Rule, wherewith they constantly charge us, that we make Reason above Revelation; and that we preferring what is Reason, (now grown Contrary, it is to be supposed,) to the Words of Revelation, rather than we will admit of any Doctrine which is contrary to Reason.

Now, First; 'Tis not true, that we prefer our Reason before Revelation: On the contrary, Revelation being what GOD himself hath told, either immediatly, or by his sacred Penmen; 'tis to be preferred before the clearest Demonstration of our Reason. But because we cannot suppose, without Disrespect and Injury to GOD, to his *Goodness* and *Veracity*, that he has so made us that our *Faculties* should be deceived, in what they *clearly* and *distinctly* perceive; and because GOD hath in Revelation frequently appealed to our Faculties, to our Understanding and Reason; therefore we conclude, that what is clearly and distinctly discovered by Reason as true or false, is so. And from thence we infer; that what is false in Reason, can never be true in Revelation, or by Revelation. So that whatsoever in Revelation doth seem to contradict Reason, can be nothing but our Blunder; our unskilful injudicious and too close Adherence to the mere Letter and Words of Revelation.

'Tis so true, that we ought to interpret the most clear Revelation, so as not to contradict evident Reason; that if we neglect this Rule, we shall oft times make Revelation contrary to, and inconsistent with itself; as well as to or with Reason: We shall be forced (for instance) to say, the Lord Christ is a

A Rock

Stephen Nye 1691

Rock, *a Way*, *a true Vine*, *a Door*, and twenty more such *different* and *contrary* things; because Revelation has *clearly* and *expressly* called him all these.

I desire therefore to know, Why our Opposers take care not to make themselves contemptible by maintaining 'tis *a Scripture-Doctrine*, that the Lord Christ is *a Rock*, *a Way*, *a true Vine*, *a Door*; on the Account that such a Doctrine, though founded on the *express* Words of Holy Scripture, is contrary to Reason: and yet have no regard to avoid the Imputation of Folly, Incogitance and Inadvertence, by contending this is *a Scripture-Doctrine*, which is no less contrary to Reason and natural Light; even this, that there are three Almighty and Infinite Persons, and yet but one GOD. No Man ever had *by Nature or Reason*, nor can have any other Notion of Three Gods, but only this; *Three Infinite and Almighty Persons*. Is it supposable, that GOD should give forth *contrary* Manifestations of himself? that he should teach us by *Nature* and *Reason*, to apprehend one GOD as but one Almighty and Infinite Person; and yet command us by *Revelation* to believe, one GOD is Three such Persons? Or can we, our selves obey contrary Commands, or believe contrary Manifestations, concerning the same thing, at the same time?

This Foundation being laid, we say, Three Divine Persons, an Almighty Father, an Almighty Son, and an Almighty Spirit, distinct from both, being *in Reason and common Sense* but the Periphrasis and Circumlocution for Three Gods; so that we can have no other Conception of Three Gods, but only Three such Persons: that *Revelation* which (by Confession of all Parties) obliges me to believe but one GOD; can never be supposed to require me to believe Three Almighty Persons.

So also, Reason assuring me, that the Disproportion between Infinite and Finite is such, that they can never be commensurate, or made one and the same: That Revelation, or Holy Scripture, which tells me GOD is infinite; that *the Heaven of Heavens contains him not*; cannot be interpreted or understood as bidding me believe, that a Person who is GOD or an Infinite Person (and such, they say, every Person of the Trinity is) can be *Whole and All* Incarnate, that is, united and commensurate to a finite Man.

We abide, Sir, by this Argument; here we fix our Foot, never to be removed: that the Inconsistence of the Trinity, and the Incarnation with Reason and natural Knowledg, being undeniably evident; therefore those Doctrines can have no real Foundation in Divine Revelation, that is to say, in Holy Scripture.

But, Secondly, *As* we consider that though Revelation is to be preferred before Reason; and always *interpreted by Reason*, for the Causes already given: so we cannot but profess our selves surprized, that any should have the Confidence to pretend, that there is *clear* and *express* Revelation, on behalf of the Trinity and Incarnation? In the Name of Wonder, what do these Gentlemen mean by *express* and *clear* Revelation: do they mean that they have found out some Texts, which directly and expressly say, *There is a Trinity of Divine Persons, who are but one GOD*; or which say, *The Son or second Person of the Trinity was incarnate*? If they have any such Texts to produce; we shall grant them, they have an *express* Revelation for those Doctrines. But in very Deed they mean no such thing: but by *clear* and *express* Revelation they mean what was never meant by any but themselves; nor by themselves in any other Case or Question, but this of the Trinity. They mean, the Trinity and Incarnation are provable, by certain most remote and strained *Consequences*, from some *such* Texts of Revelation or Scripture; as either are of *suspected* Authority and Credit in the Original, among the Learned of their own Party; or are denied by the Learnedest of their own side, to be truly translated; or finally are interpreted by their own principal Criticks, in such manner as Socinians and Unitarians interpret them. What is this but to say, that is an *express* Revelation,

velation, which is only an harsh and doubtful *Consequence*, framed by themselves; and that is a *clear* Revelation for these Doctrines, which the best and most knowing of their own Party interpret to a contrary Sense?

Perhaps, Sir, you may be a little surprised at what I here affirm: but so it is, and I make challenge to any of our Opposers to convict me of Falshood; that there is no Text of Holy Scripture alledged for the Trinity or Incarnation, which all the *Catholick* Doctors, and some or other of the most discerning and eminent Interpreters and Critics of the *Protestants*, have not acknowledged, that *'tis not to the purpose of the Trinity or Incarnation.* The Texts that are cited for the Trinity or Incarnation, are either out of the Old Testament, or out of the New.

As to the Texts of the Old Testament, the Learned among our Opposers (of all Persuasions) laugh at those that pretend to find the Trinity or the Incarnation, in the Books of the Old Testament: 'Tis universally agreed among the more Learned Trinitarians, that (to use the Words of an Author and Book, licensed by the famous Faculty of the *Sorbon*) *Ex veteri Testamento nihil præter umbras, i. e.* 'There is nothing urged for the 'Trinity out of any Book or Books of the 'Old Testament, but mere Umbrages and 'Shadows. *J. Salabert. Hæres. damnat. par. add.*

Then for the New Testament, all the *Catholick* Doctors own, what D. *Petavius* (the most learned Writer of the most learned *Order* among them) has thought fit to express in these Words. 'They that would prove 'the Trinity out of only the Words of Scripture, without taking to their Aid the 'Churches Interpretation and Authority, *Sudant plus satis, & sæp. artificio vincuntur, i. e.* 'They sweat to no purpose; and are beaten 'at their own Weapon (*Scripture*) by their 'Adversaries the Socinians and Arians. D. *Petav. de Trin. l. 3. c. 11. §. 9.*

Protestants indeed have been somewhat more careful of such free and general Acknowledgments; because they know there is no trusting to *Tradition*, and the Authority of the Fathers; on which the *Catholicks* (so called) wholly relie in these Questions. Notwithstanding, even *Protestants* have, among them, given up to us, all their Scripture-Strengths. That Text cannot be named, which some or other of the Learnedest *Protestants* have not, either interpreted as 'tis interpreted by Socinians and Arians; or expressly said, 'twas not intended by the inspired Author concerning the Incarnation or Trinity, or any Person therein. *I demand such a Text of our Opposers; and do here profess, that if they name it not, 'tis because they cannot.*

I will leave it here with you, Sir, Whether *this first* be not a just Exception to these Doctrines: even this, that they have no sufficient Foundation in Holy Scripture, by Confession of the *most* and the *learnedest* of our Opposers; and that being evidently false in *Reason*, they cannot possibly be true in Divine *Revelation* or Scripture.

Our *Second Reason* against them, is;

'There has never yet been any Apology or 'Defence made (nor can be) for the *confess'd* 'Inconsistency of these Doctrines with Rea-'son; but what is equally applicable to the 'Transubstantiation, or any other absurd and 'impossible Doctrine.

Our Opposers being sensible, how great a Prejudice 'tis to their Cause, that their Doctrines are so directly contrary to Reason, so utterly inconsistent with our natural Knowledg and congenit Notions; which were given us by GOD to be Tests or Touch-stones, whereby to discern Truth from Falshood: they have therefore turned themselves all ways, to find a Remedy for this Evil.

The *Sum* and *Force* of what they have been observed to say, either in their *Books* or *Sermons*, is as follows. 'The Trinity and Incarnation are indeed incomprehensible Mysteries: but Almighty God hath a Right to 'require of us, to believe on his Word what 'we do not comprehend or understand. He 'has already posed us with divers Mysteries 'and (seeming) Contradictions to our Rea-'son and Capacities, in finite, visible and

'ordinary Objects; thereby to prepare and 'dispose us, to receive with an humble 'Faith, what he shall please to reveal in his 'Word, concerning Objects invisible and in'finite. Whatsoever is matter of *pure* and '*mere* Revelation, is not to be judged by el'ther *Reason* or *Sense*: concerning such 'things there is a Necessity to acquiesce in 'Revelation only; how unaccountable and 'wonderful soever they may seem. And if 'Revelation is so express and clear concern'ing them; that we would believe, were it 'not for their (supposed) Contradiction to 'Reason: in that case Reason must submit to 'Revelation; else we fall into the horrible 'both Impiety and Foolery, of giving the 'Lie to God, and preferring our Knowledg 'before his. What is the Union of the Soul 'with the Body? how do the Parts of Mat'ter hold together? are Bodies made up of 'divisible Parts, or of indivisible? If we 'cannot answer these, and divers such like 'Questions, without involving our selves in 'great Difficulties, and even in Contradicti'ons: Why do we wonder, that there may 'be some (seeming) Contradictions, in what 'we are taught about the Divine Nature, or 'GOD? Which of the Attributes of GOD 'is not as incomprehensible, as the Trinity 'or the Incarnation? Do we comprehend 'GOD's *Eternity*, by which he possesses eter'nal Life, *all at once*; or his *Immensity*, by 'which he is *whole and all* present in every 'Point of Space? Can a finite Mind com'prehend Infinite Wisdom, Infinite Justice, 'Infinite Power, or ought else that is infi'nite?

'How many have been as confident, that 'the very Notion of a *Spirit* implies a Con'tradiction; and that 'tis not possible there 'should be *Antipodes*: as any Unitarian can 'be; that the *Trinity* is a Contradiction to 'Reason, and the *Incarnation* impossible? 'This should make us cautious and modest; 'it should serve to instruct us, that 'tis easy 'for us to mistake our own Shallowness, and 'our Errors, for Impossibilities and Con'tradictions to true Reason.

'Finally, As hot as the Unitarians are a'gainst *Mysteries*, and *incomprehensible things*; 'themselves, for all that, advance as many 'and as great, as those which they oppose.

You know, Sir, that I have elsewhere answer'd particularly and severally, to all the Parts of this Defence: but here I will be content to answer in general; that *what will prove every thing, will prove nothing*. This Defence or Proof will serve as well for the Transubstantiation, or any other absurd and impossible Doctrine, as for the Trinity or Incarnation.

I am resolved to keep close to *clear* and *express* Revelation: therefore our Saviour himself having said expressly, that he is "Αμπελος αληθινη, *the true Vine*, John 15. 1. I maintain that as 'twas certain by *Sense* to those who conversed with him, that he was a true and very *Man*, so 'tis certain by *Revelation* that he was also a true and very *Vine*. 'That any Person should be a true Man and 'yet a true Vine, is indeed *an incomprehensible 'Mystery*: but Almighty God hath a Right to 'require of us, to believe on his Word, what 'we cannot comprehend or understand. He 'hath already posed us with divers Mysteries 'and (seeming) Contradictions, in visible 'and ordinary Objects, both of Sense and 'Reason: thereby to prepare and dispose us, 'to receive with an humble Faith, what him'self should reveal in his Word. That the 'Lord Christ is a true Man, and at the same 'time a true and very Vine, is a Point of *pure* 'and *mere* Revelation; and no way knowable 'by Sense or Reason: therefore as to his *Vi'ney* Nature we ought to acquiesce in Reve'lation, without further Scruple or Inquiry. 'The Revelation concerning it, is so *clear* and '*express*, *I am* Αμπελος αληθινη, *the true 'Vine*; that to quarrel with this Doctrine, 'is to give the Lie to God, and prefer our 'Knowledg before his. What is the Union 'of the Soul with the Body? How do the 'Parts of Matter hold together? Are Bodies 'made up of divisible Parts, or of indivisi'ble? If we cannot answer to these and such 'like Questions; without involving our selves

'in

'in great Difficulties, and even in Contra-'dictions: Why do we admire that there 'may be some (seeming) Contradictions, in 'our Lord Christ's being both a Man and a 'Vine? Do we better comprehend, how 'GOD possesses eternal Life *all at once*; or 'how he is *whole and all* present to every se-'veral Point of Space: than we apprehend, 'how the Lord Christ may be both a Man 'and a Vine? Who can comprehend infinite 'Wisdom, infinite Justice, or ought else 'that is infinite? but if we do not compre-'hend those Attributes, why do we pretend 'to comprehend the Extent of infinite Pow-'er; or to say of it, *Hitherto shalt thou come, 'and no further*; thou canst make a Man or a 'Vine, but canst not make an *human Vine*, 'or a *Vinely Man*? How many have been as 'confident, that the very Notion of a *Spirit* 'implies a Contradiction to our Reason; and 'that there can possibly be no *Antipodes*: as 'any *Anti-Scripturist* and *Idolater of Reason* can be, that 'tis a Contradiction and impossi-'ble, that a Man should be a true Vine, and 'a Vine a true Man? This should make us 'cautious and modest; it should serve to in-'struct us, that 'tis easy for us to mistake our 'own Shallowness and Errors, for Impossibi-'lities and Contradictions to true Reason. 'And as hot as some (many perchance) be 'against this Scripture-Mystery, that a Man 'is both a Man and a Vine; themselves find 'greater Mysteries in the same Holy Scrip-'ture. 'Tis (for Example) a greater Leap 'from Finite to Infinite, and from Man to 'God; than from Man to Vine downwards, 'or from Vine to Man upwards: whatever 'Explication will make the former of these 'but *possible*, will make either of the o-'ther two *easy*. We shall have no Difficulty 'in apprehending, that a Man may be a 'Vine, and a Vine a Man; if we can get but 'the Glimpse of a Conception, how a Man 'may be GOD, or GOD a Man; or how 'there can be such a Person as GOD-MAN.

If you tell me, Sir, that this Parallel is somewhat too light in so serious and grave a Question, as that depending between us and the Trinitarians; I must intreat you to show me, where I have made a false Step: for if I have made none, I must take leave to tell you; the Parallel is no more light, than the Doctrines which gave occasion to it. Mean and childish Errors are never so effectually and successfully detected; as by the most familiar and easy Parallels: and he that makes the Comparison, is not to be blamed; but he or they that gave the Occasion of it. I think the Parallel I have made, serves to show, that we are never to talk of *clear* Revelation or *express* Revelation, in Excuse or Defence of absurd Doctrines: but that 'tis necessary to interpret all both *Speech* and *Writing*, in Consistence with common *Sense* and our natural Knowledg. In fine, it serves to establish this Rule; if the Person speaking or writing, is fallible, *we must try* the Truth of what is said or written, by *Reason*: but if he is infallible, 'tis always his meaning, that we should *interpret* what he hath said or written, by that Reason and according to those natural Notions, which he hath bestowed on us *chiefly for that purpose*.

I pass to our *Third Reason*, or third Exception, against these Doctrines.

'These Doctrines are as little consistant 'with *Piety* toward GOD, as they are with '*Reason* and with *natural Knowledg*.

Piety (in proper Speaking) is that part of the Christian's Duty, which he owes to GOD. And though the Goodness of GOD had divers other Ends (Ends respecting the *Comfort and Good* of his Creatures) why he was pleased to make what he hath made; yet it becomes us to esteem and regard Piety, or our Duty and Service to GOD, as the *great End* that we ought to pursue.

The chief Parts or Branches of Piety, are *Praise, Love, Faith, Devotion, Obedience*. Let us see what Agreement these, of any of these, have with the Doctrines of which we are discoursing.

1. The respectful and thankful Recognition, both in our Minds, and by our Words, of the *Works* of God, and of his *Divine Attributes*; is what all Men call *the Praise* of

GOD,

GOD. But doth he or she thus praise GOD, who ascribe his Works, Creation, Conservation, Miracles, all providential Acts; to any other Person or Persons besides him, who is indeed the Author of them? But when besides this, we give to *the Gods of our own devising*, the Glory of all the incommunicable Attributes, even *infinite* and *underived* Wisdom, Justice, Power and Goodness; when we affirm, that in all these Properties they are equal to the supream *Father* and *GOD of Gods*: what further *Detraction from his Praise* can be conceived, but absolute Atheism?

2. For the *LOVE* of GOD. How can we love the true God, in such manner as he requires, *with all the Heart, and all the Soul, and all the Mind*; if we have, and profess also to have as much Love for two other Persons, as for him who is the only true and legitimate Object of our *highest Love*? If we consider that Love which we owe to GOD, in its Causes; they are his supream *Excellence*, and his *Merit* and *Desert* towards us: if in its Effects they are a Conformity to his Will; a Readiness, Promptness and Desire to suffer the extremest Evils, for his Sake and Service. If therefore this Love be transferred, if it be communicated to other Objects, besides that one to which we owe it: We do *thereby* and *therein* ascribe to them his *Excellence*; we impute to them his *Merit*; we pay to them his *Dues*. Is it no Impiety, or rather is it not a deadly Wound to true Piety, thus to misplace the Propensions of our Minds, the Affections of our Hearts, the Use and Service of our whole Man?

3. I do not say, How *lame*, but what a *Monster* is that *Faith*, that is made up of *contradictory* Parts; of Propositions that destroy one another; of such Inconsistencies, that in saying and affirming one, you (either expressly or implicitly) deny the other?

In their Doctrine of the *Incarnation* they tell us; *an infinite* Person is *whole* and *all* united to *a finite* Man. Is not this *a contradictory* Faith? doth it not confound Infinite with Finite, and make them to be all one? doth it not destroy all the Demonstrations of *Geometry*; and thereby contradict both our *rational Faculties* and our *Senses*?

Their Doctrine of the *Trinity* is, in short, this. There are *three* Infinite, Almighty, All-wise *Persons*, *three* eternal *Beings*, *three* absolutely-perfect *Spirits*, and yet but *one GOD*. Is not this a *contradictory* Faith? Doth it not destroy our *natural Ideas*, our *congenit Notions*? For what are three Gods, but three such Persons: and what is the Idea, Notion or Conception of but *one God*, which is natural and congenit to every Man; but *one* Infinite Almighty All-wise *Person*, *one* eternal *Being*, *one* absolutely perfect *Spirit*?

As to the late Attempts of some, to satisfy (in part) these Difficulties: you know, Sir, how vain and fruitless they have been. Dr. *Wallis* saith, the three Divine Persons are only three *Modes* (that is, three *Qualifications*, or three *Respects* of GOD towards his Creatures) and they make one GOD *as Understanding, Will and Memory make one Soul*. But this, saith Dr. *Sherlock*, *is both Non-sense and Heresy*. How doth Dr. *Sherlock* mend the matter? Why he hath advanced an Explication of the Trinity, which Dr. *Wallis* and other Orthodox Men have, in Print, condemned as *Tritheism*; that is, as introducing three Gods; a far worse Heresy than *Socinianism*. And thereupon they tell Dr. *Sherlock*, in Print also: 'That though he hath not 'been counted a Fool, yet it may become 'a wise Man to change his Opinion. In a Word, they have (in civil Language) invited him to a *Recantation*.

4. How is *DEVOTION* (another principal Instance of *Piety*) disturbed, by such a strange and unaccountable Object of it? Devotion is senseless and irrational, if the Object to be adored and worshipped, be not conceived by it. But such of Necessity must be the Worship and Devotion of Trinitarians; if in their *Prayers* they keep to their *Belief*. For they may talk of a Trinity; but themselves will not pretend, that they can *think* it: they can have no Conception of it, no more than of Words without Sense. We

have

have seen very lately, that those who have indeavoured to make Sense of this (as they call it) *Mystery*, or to represent it as a *possible* and *intelligible* thing; not only accuse one another of *Heresy*, and demand a *Recantation*, but are generally disclaimed by their own Party. The Party itself (if you mean there, by the general Body of Trinitarians) are for *a Trinity which no Man understands*; or ought to pretend to give other Account of it, than that 'tis an *incomprehensible Mystery*; and this Trinity they call their GOD. And thus by their own Confession, that Blame and Reprimand which our Saviour gives to the *Samaritans*, is equally applicable to them; and what he saith of himself and the *Jews*, is verified in the Unitarians: *Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship*, John 4. 22.

3. As to *Obedience*; the last part of our *Piety* towards GOD, and the most necessary: the Obligation to it, and all occasion for it is wholly taken away, by the Doctrine of the *Incarnation*, and the Superstruction which Trinitarians build thereon.

They say, GOD *the Son* being incarnate in our Nature, did by his *active Righteousness* fulfil *for us* all *Obedience*. By his Sufferings in this Life, his Death and Descent into Hell (which things they call his *Passive Righteousness*): He more than exhausted all that *Punishment*, that is or can be due to Sin. Whatsoever he did, was (they say) *for us*; and his Righteousness was meritorious of Heaven for never so many Sinners; and what he *suffered* was *in our stead* also; and one Drop of his Blood was sufficient to ransom a thousand Worlds from the Demerit of their Sins: that is, from Hell and all other Punishments. The manifest Consequences of these Doctrines, are these: (1.) Gospel-Obedience, good Works, (or a good Life) are in us unnecessary and superfluous: some of them have said, *hurtful and dangerous* to Justification and Salvation. (2.) Heaven is so much every Sinner's just Due and Debt from GOD, without any Amendment or Newness of Life on their Parts, that GOD would be *unjust* in giving them no more, if more could be given. (3.) GOD should be *unrighteous*, if he punish'd Men for Sin, though unrepented of; because we have in Christ our Representative, both fulfilled all *Righteousness*, and *suffered* and paid a more than sufficient Price of Redemption.

The notorious *Decay of Christian Piety* in all Places and Ages, since these Doctrines have prevailed, plainly shows, That these are not *speculative* Consequences only, but such real Consequences, as do much influence the Practice of most Men. One may know and be assured, that 'tis these Consequences and this Belief, which bolsters Men up in their wicked Courses; because these are the things that comfort and support such, at their Deaths. The greatest of Sinners go away with Peace of Mind; on the Reflection and Consideration of the infinite *Merits* and *Satisfaction* of GOD *their Redeemer*. They have not, nor can out-sin his Satisfaction and Deserts, and applying both to themselves *in believing in him*; that is, by believing he merited and suffered *for them in particular*: therefore they depart, assuredly expecting of GOD the Rewards that are appointed to only *Innocence and Well-doing*.

I pray, Sir, desire your Friends who find Fault with us, for reviving (as they say) *unnecessary* Questions, to take it into serious and impartial Consideration; Whether Doctrines that have these Consequences, and also are such Hindrances of the other Branches of Piety, ought not to be again (and again) examined, whether they are (or can be) true?

The *Fourth Reason* against them is this;

"They have crumbled the Christian "Church, into innumerable and unreconci-"lable Factions and Parties; so that there is "no possible way of restoring Peace, but by "returning to the *Belief* and *Profession* of the "Unity of God.

Next to Godliness or *Piety*, the *Peace* of the Christian Churches should be the Wish and Indeavour of every Christian Man. But the Doctrines under Consideration, have so

divided.

divided the Churches called after the Name of Christ; that there is no Agreement but among those Professors, who believe there is but one GOD, or but one who is God. The Orthodox (as they call themselves) are so *multifariously* divided, that they are not (perhaps) ten of them in a Party. The whole *Mobile* indeed of them go under the common Name of *Trinitarians*; and the Trinity and Incarnation are the general Tests of Orthodoxy, among them; but this is *an Orthodoxy only of Names and Words*; for in interpreting those Words and Names, I doubt very much, whether there are *ten* of them that are of a Mind. And the Dissent among them is so bitter and unreconcilable, that the *Anathema's* fly as thick and fast at one another, as at the Unitarians. As many Parties as they are, each Party is *heretick*, and in a State of Damnation, in the Opinion of all the rest. Their Divisions do respect some of them the Doctrine of the Trinity; and some the Incarnation: I will reckon them up as they shall occur to my Mind; without regarding that Method which might be given to Error.

1. The first Difference is about the *Filioque*, or whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father only, or from the Father and the Son? This Quarrel divides them into two great and almost equal Parties; into the Church of the East, and the Church of the West. The Eastern Church, that is to say, all *Asia* and *Africa*, *Greece*, and the Islands of the *Archipelago*, all *Moscovy*, and the Provinces of *Illyricum*, a good Part of *Poland*, and some Part of *Hungary*; all these maintain, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the *Father* only. But the Western Church, that is, all the *Roman Catholick* Nations, and all the *Reformed* or *Protestants*, contend that the Spirit proceeds from the Father *and from the Son*. There is no Trinitarian but is in one of these Parties; and consequently none of them, but who is an *heretick*, and in a State of Damnation, in the Judgment and Opinion of the one Moiety or half of his Fellow-Trinitarians. But because this damning of one another, upon this Difference between them, has been of late so confidently denied by Dr. *Wallis* and Dr. *Sherlock*; I am obliged to take notice of the publick Declarations of these two Churches, against one another. The whole *Western* Church, in the first Canon of the second general Council of *Lions*, saith, *Damnamus & reprobamus, &c. l. 1.* 'We 'damn and reprobate all such as presume to 'deny, that the Holy Spirit doth *eternally* pro-'ceed from the Father *and from the Son*. On the other Hand the Eastern Church *excommunicates* as Schismaticks and Heretocks all the *Latins* (so they call the Western Churches which hold the *Filioque*; or that the Spirit proceeds from the Father *and from the Son*) on every *Holy Thursday*, and all other principal Holy-days. *F. Simon Crit. Hist. of the Religions of the East*, p. 16, 17.

2. These two mighty Parties are again subdivided, into a great many factious Differences. Into *those* (for instance) who teach, that but one Person of their (supposed) Trinity was incarnate; and *those* who contend that the whole Trinity was incarnate.

3. Into *those* who say, all the Persons in the Trinity are equal; and those who (on the contrary) ascribe to *the Father* a Prerogative and Superiority, above the other two Persons; a Superiority not only πρωτεῖα *of Order*, and ἀξιωματικὸν *of Dignity*, but δυναστεῖα *of Power*.

4. Into *those* who say *the Son* is ὑποβεβηκὼς, *i.e.* hath underived Godhead, or is GOD of himself; and *those* that hold he is *GOD of GOD*, that is, derived from *the Father*, Being, Life and Godhead.

5. Into *those* who say *the Son* is so the Wisdom of the Father, that he is *the Wisdom by which the Father is wise*; and into those who deny this, as little better than Blasphemy; because 'tis as much as to say, that the Father (without the Son) is ἄλογος and ἄλογος, *irrational and unwise*.

6. In what Sense the three Persons are *consubstantial* (that is, have the same Substance or Essence, or Nature) doth unreconcilably divide them; the Ancients from the Mo-

Moderns, and the Moderns from one another. One Party saith, Father, Son, and Spirit, are *generically* (or if you will *specifically*) consubstantial; that is, as three Men are consubstantial to one another, because all of them partake of the same *specifick* Nature, even the humane; or as three *Guineas* are consubstantial, being all of them Gold. The contrary Party saith, the Divine Persons are *numerically* consubstantial, *i. e.* do all subsist in the *self-same* Substance or Essence: as Understanding, Will and Memory, subsist in one and the same Soul.

7. They dispute, whether upon the Incarnation of *the Son*, the Lord Christ became two Persons; or was only one Person, whom they call by a compound and *monstrous* Name Θεανθρωπος, or GOD-MAN. If the latter of these, the Virgin *Mary* was *Θεοτοκος*, *Mother of God*; if the other, she was only Χριστοτοκος, *Mother of Christ*.

8. Besides the Dispute about *the Persons*, there is a great Controversy among them, about the *Natures* in the Lord Christ. The *Eutychian* Trinitarians say, the Lord Christ hath but one Nature; the rest of them (called *Melchites*) affirm two distinct Natures, an humane as well as a divine.

9. 'Tis controverted among them, whether in Consequence of the Incarnation of *the Son* or *WORD*, there followed two *Wills* and two *Actions* in the Lord Christ; or only one Action and one Will? Also,

10. Whether by Virtue of the Incarnation, the Body of the Lord Christ became incorruptible, and exempt from humane Affections and Passions; or not? Farther,

11. Whether the humane Nature of Christ, being personally united to *the Son* or *WORD*, were not by Virtue of that Union *Omniscient*; knowing even when the Day of Judgment shall be?

12. Whether this Proposition be Orthodox, or on the contrary *the Seed* of the Devil, one Person of the Blessed Trinity hath *suffered* for us?

13. Whether the Son and Spirit have been once *generated* and *breathed*, and that *from all Eternity*; or whether they are *continually* and *always* begotten and breathed?

14. They all agree, that there are three Divine *Persons*: but to make this no Agreement, they are divided in explaining what is to be understood by the Word *Persons*. Some say, the three *Persons* are three *Properties* of the Divine Nature. But these agree not; some making them to be *Properties* in the same *numerical* Nature. Others take them to be *distinctive* Properties in *the specifick* Nature. Others say, the three *Persons* are three *Modes* of Subsistence, or three *Relations*, or three *Respects* of GOD towards his Creatures, or three *Operations*. Others affirm the three *Persons* to be so many several or distinct *intellectual Beings* and *Spirits*; as distinct from one another as three humane Persons (or three Men) are.

15. To add now no more. They require us to believe, that these Almighty Persons are but one God: but in what Sense or Manner, three such Persons make one GOD, is not only disputed among them; but they are here also Apostates and Heretics to one another. Some resolve this *Mystery* (as they call it) by an Unity or Oneness of Affection, Will and Design, between the three Persons: as St. *Paul*, speaking of himself and *Apollos*, saith, *He that planteth, and he that waterth, are one*, 1 Cor. 3. 8. Others say, the Son and Spirit are one GOD with the Father, by their most perfect Subordination or Subjection to him: All three making but *one Monarchy*, are therefore said to be but *one GOD*.

Again, some say, the three Persons are one GOD by their *Περιχωρησις*, or In-being in one another. But others by Περιχωρησις, or *being in one another*, understand only this, that the Relation of *Father* supposeth and includeth that of *Son*, and *vice versâ*; and not that by an impossible *real In-being*, the three Divine Persons are as it were *mingled*, and so confounded.

We have been told by others, that the three Persons are three distinct Minds and Spirits; and that the only possible Union of

Spirits is *mutual Consciousness*: So that (in short) the three Divine Persons are one GOD, *as* (or *because*) they are intimately conscious to one anothers Thoughts and Actions.

Figally, Some say, the three Persons are one GOD; by their all having the same *numerical* Essence or Substance.

There are, Sir, you see, no fewer than fifteen Divisions among our Opposers; each Division consisting of two Parties at the least, some of them of four or five. So there are in all about *forty* Parties of them; of which incomparably the greater Number are *Hereticks* and *damned* to all the other Parties among them. Give me leave to make two Observations hereupon.

(1.) The great and common Boast of Trinitarians, even their *Numbers*, on the Account of which they presume to call themselves the Catholick (or *Universal*) Church, is merely a Boast. It may be (not untruly) said; *They are the least of Parties*, that ever professed a Religion. To comprehend this, Sir, you need only suppose, a Person resolving to join himself to their *universal* Church, and in order thereto determining upon all the forementioned Heads of Controversy among them. For by that time he has so done, that is, has chosen his side in all the aforesaid Questions: It will be no less than a *Miracle* if he finds himself Orthodox and Catholick, in the Opinion of *ten* Persons besides himself; it may be, the *universal* Church will dwindle into his single Person. For these *forty* Parties of Trinitarians are not all of them so many visible and associated Sects or Churches; but divers of them are Divisions and Heresies in one and the same associated Church: the Members of the same Church are in these Points divided, and heretick to one another. And the Number *Forty* affords so many *Changes*; that (as I said) perhaps it will be impossible to find *ten* Trinitarians, who are intirely of a Mind in all the above-said Points and Questions. This evidently reduces the (pretended) *Catholick* Church or *Universal* Church, to a much more contemptible Paucity, than are the Worshippers of one only GOD; or, as our Opposers by way of Jest sometimes call us, *the little Flock*: to which (however) their Father hath promised, *to give them a Kingdom*.

(2.) Whereas Trinitarians generally pretend; and that as an Argument which ought to end all further Dispute about these Matters; that the Trinity and Incarnation are *Traditions* derived down to our times, thro all the intermediate Ages, and by all the Churches professing Christianity: these Divisions among them plainly demonstrate the contrary. For if the Trinity and Incarnation are *Traditions*, how comes it to pass, that Trinitarians are in such contrary Tales about them? how is it that not *ten* of them, perhaps not two of them, are in the same Story concerning them? They agree in nothing but the Words *Trinity* and *Incarnation*; and are forced to acknowledg, that those very Words are not only *unscriptural*, but not very ancient. *Tertullian* among the *Latins*, and *Clemens Alexandr.* among the *Greeks*, were the first of Christians, who used the word *Trinity*; and for Incarnation, I do not remember it to be so ancient.

But I have often wondred at this Pretence of most Trinitarians, that these Doctrines are *Traditions* from the first Ages of Christianity. On another Account it is this; All the *Criticks* (without excepting one) who have made a Judgment of the Writings of the Fathers of the first 300 Years; and particularly *which* of those Writings are genuine and uncorrupted, *which* wholly feigned or otherways corrupted; I say, all the *Criticks* constantly make this a Note of Forgery or Corruption, *if those Writings speak any what expressly or evidently of these Doctrines*, namely, the Trinity and Incarnation, and the Questions on them depending. If these Doctrines were *Traditions* from the first Ages, the higher we ascend in Time, the more express and clear would the Tradition about them be: And in confessing that 'tis quite contrary, the *Criticks*, (that is, the more Learned of the Trinitarians) have given up the Pretence of

Tradition

Tradition and *Antiquity*, and make it probable, I may say unavoidable, that these Doctrines are not Traditions from the Ancients, but Novelties, and Corruptions, and Depravations of genuine Christianity.

Whereas some have indeavour'd to evade this, by saying, Those Fathers have made no distinct Mention of, or Determination in these Points; because they were not controverted in their times, but afterwards began to be disputed and denied by Men affecting Novelty and Singularity. I answer, Nothing can be more frivolous or false than this Pretext. For, 1. 'tis notoriously false, that these Doctrines were not denied in the times of those Fathers. The *Nazarens* and *Theodotians* are more ancient than any of the Fathers; and yet 'tis well known, nay, confess'd by all, that those Sects held the very Doctrines that are now called *Socinianism*. 2. Admitting there was as yet none (or very little) Controversy about these Points; yet because they are pretended to be the *Essentials* and *Fundamentals* of Christianity, so that he that denies them, is an *Heretick*; and he that knows them not, is *no Christian*; what can we rationally infer, but this, that the Fathers, who have not delivered these Doctrines in any of their Writings, neither believed nor knew them; and that they are a part of *the gradual Corruptions* which have so unhappily deformed the Church. 3. Admitting once more, that there was as yet no Controversy about these Questions, which is the thing for which these learned Men contend, and their only Excuse on the behalf of those first Fathers; yet this makes wholly for the Unitarians. For besides this Defect, the Fathers and first Ages have spoken in their Creed, altogether as the *Socinian* Unitarians now do. The Creed called *the Apostles* (*because it contains the true Apostolick Doctrine and Tradition*) was the only Creed of those Fathers and Ages; it was, as one of them speaks of it, their *Regula Fidei immobilis irreformabilis*, i. e. the unchangable unalterable Rule of their Faith. But this Creed expresses the very Doctrine of the present Socinians, and not of the Church; as our Opposers themselves are constrained to own. It attributeth the Appellation *GOD*, and the Creation of Heaven and Earth, to only the *Almighty Father*. It describeth the Son as only a Man; declaring his Conception by the Holy Ghost in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*, his Birth, Death, Resurrection and Ascension into Heaven, without the least Intimation of an eternal Generation from the Essence of the Father; or that he or the Holy Ghost are GOD. It saith no higher thing of them, than it saith of the Holy Catholick Church; I believe *in* the Holy Ghost, I believe *in* the Holy Catholick Church: for so (all know) this Creed is read in the Original Greek, and by all the Fathers.

Is it now, Sir, conceivable, that these Doctrines should be (as Trinitarians pretend) a *Tradition* constantly preserved; when their own *Criticks* reject the Works of those first Fathers, as certainly spurious or forged, that speak any what directly or explicitly of the Trinity, and other depending Points and Questions; and when besides their *common* and *only* Creed is undeniably *Socinian*?

I deny not, Sir, that the Fathers of the first 300 Years, whose Writings have been suffered to come down to Posterity, began to corrupt the true Doctrine concerning *the Person of our Saviour*; making him to be much greater than he was. From about the Year 150, some of them were got into the Opinions, that were afterwards called *Arianism* or the *Arian* Trinity. But this I affirm, and all the *Criticks* among the Trinitarians do own it; that *those Fathers spake not of the Trinity, and of the Points and Questions thereto depending, as the Church now doth*: they so held a kind of Trinity, as not to destroy the Unity of GOD; or that only the Father is *truly* and *properly* GOD. But this was a Digression.

I proceed to our *fifth Reason* against these Doctrines.

'They have been partly the *direct* and *necessary* Causes, partly the *unhappy* Occasions 'of divers scandalous and hurtful Errors and

Heresies; particularly of those which compose the gross Body of *Popery*.

'Tis well observed by some, that *one Absurdity (or Error) being introduced*, 'tis *always the Ground and Occasion of many more*. This Aphorism was never more sadly verified, than in the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation. For no sooner were these Doctrines, by the Countenance of sanguinary and arbitrary Edicts of the *Byzantine* Emperours, become the more general and current Belief of the Churches, but there immediately broke in after them, that Swarm of absurd and heretical Doctrines which have no less than *subverted* the true and primitive Christianity.

1. The *first-born* of the Trinity was *the Supremacy of the Pope*. A few Bishops, not a fifth Part of the Bishops of the Catholick Church, having presumed in the Council of *Nice*, *Anno* 325, to determine for the whole Catholick Church so great a Point as this; that *there is more than one Divine and Eternal Person*: they sent the *new* Creed and Acts of that Council, to the Churches and Bishops who had not been present at it; to be by them subscribed. Hereupon the Bishops of *Asia* assembling themselves in about 30 *provincial* Councils, rejected the Word *Consubstantial* (or of the same Substance with the Father) in which the whole Mystery of *Trinitarianism*, and the Strest of the *Nicene* Creed, does lie: they would by no means admit of this Word. So saith *Marcus Ephesius*, the most Learned of the *Greeks*. *Concil. Florent. Sess.* 5.

The Bishops of *Germany* and of *Belgium* (now the *Low-Countries*) and of *Gaul* (now *France*) and of the three Provinces of *Great Britain*, would not receive the Creed of *Nice*, giving this Reason, that the Word *Consubstantial* is unscriptural. So saith St. *Hilary*, that great Adversary of the *Arians* and other Unitarians, towards the beginning of his Book, *de Synod.*

The Bishops of *Africa* seem not so much as to have taken into their Archives or Registries, the Acts, Canons, or Creed of *Nice*. For in the Year 418, in a Contest between them and the Bishop of *Rome*; they sent to *Constantinople* and *Alexandria*, for Copies of the Acts of the *Nicene* Council. *Concil. Carthag.* 6. *Anno* 418.

The *Nicene* Council being thus refused and despised by all the considerable Nations professing Christianity: the *Nicene* Faction of Bishops began to consult of a way, how to settle their beloved Doctrine by political Arts; and at length they resolved upon this Expedient.

Anno 347, having got on their side the Emperor *Constans*; and finding that the Bishops and Church of *Rome* were thoroughly in their Interests, they assembled in Council at *Sardica*, and there made those famous Canons, on which (all learned Men know) the Authority and Supremacy of the Bishops of *Rome* is wholly grounded, and which those Bishops have ever since exercised. They designed by these Canons, to secure the Bishops and other Ecclesiasticks of the *Nicene* Party (now called *Trinitarians*) in their Bishopricks and other Church-Dignities; and to eject from time to time all *Unitarians*. But these *Politicians* were quite out, in hoping for such an Effect: they were so far from governing the Catholick Church by those Canons, that they served to no other purpose, but the ingraving the Makers of them and their Successors to the Popes of *Rome*. But for a fuller Account, *Sir*, of this *Sardican* Council (or rather Conventicle) I refer you to *the Acts of* Athanasius, lately published, in which the History of these *Barbarous* of the Catholick Church is fully related.

2. In the Year 431, it was concluded and determined by the Trinitarian Faction, assembled in Council at *Ephesus*; that GOD the Son was truly and properly incarnate in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*, and was born of her; so that *Mary* was not only *Christotokos*, *Mother of Christ*, but *Theotokos*, *Mother of God*. This blasphemous and contradictory Conclusion being once made; immediately they fell to worshipping and praying to her. If

GOD

GOD the Son is to be worship'd and invocated, shall we turn our Backs on *the Mother of God?* Shall not she be able to help us, at least by way of *Intercession*, to whom the Angel said, *Thou art highly honoured of GOD*; and who was (as it were) Wife to GOD the Father, and (in very Deed) Mother to GOD the Son? Father *Simon*, in the 2d Chapter of the Critical History of the Religions of the *East*, saith, 'It is chiefly since the Birth of '*Nestorianism* (that is since the Council of *E*'*phesus*) that so much respect hath been 'shown to the Virgin *Mary*. He means, she was not so much worship'd and invocated, till that Council had determined against *Nestorius*, that she is *Θεοτόκος*, *Mother of GOD*. But Father *Simon* will never be able to show, that Holy *Mary* was at all worship'd or prayed unto, till the *Ephesin* Council had decreed, that she is to be deem'd *the Mother of GOD*. I do challenge him, or any for him, to produce any Testimony of the Ancients for the Worship and Invocation of *Mary*, that is so ancient as the *Ephesin* Council. This Father should therefore have dealt as ingenuously and freely in this Case, as is his manner in most others; or should have said nothing at all of this matter, but have chose some other Instance to confirm what he had to say. He should have owned what he knows to be the Truth, that as the Doctrine of the Incarnation produced this impious and senseless Conclusion, that *Mary* is the Mother of GOD; so that Conclusion was the Cause of the idolatrious Worship and Invocation of her, by the far greater part of Christians; even by all *Catholicks* (so called) and by the whole *Eastern* Church.

3. After *Mary* was worship'd and prayed to, it soon became the Custom to pray also to the *Apostles* and *Martyrs*, and afterwards to other *Saints*, and reputed Saints. For if *Mary* who (confessedly) was but a *Woman* and a *Saint*; though she was Mother of GOD; can help us by her Intercession: Why may not others, who were perhaps as great Saints as she?

4. The Practice of worshipping Holy *Mary*, and other *Saints*, had been but a little while received in the Churches; but it occasioned the Worship of their *Images* and Pictures. For if the Saints are to be worship'd, then so too are their Images and Pictures, *with a relative Worship*; that is, for the sake of those whom they represent; and so that the Worship *ultimately* terminates, not in the Image, but in the Saint. Even as the Royal Chair, or Throne, is worship'd for the King's sake, though he be absent.

5. The Question about the Worship of Images, was long concerted in the Church. Those that stood for that Worship, thought it a very heinous Disrespect to our Saviour; that no Honour should be shown to his Picture or Image, no more than if it were the Image or Picture of *a Heathen God*. And this was a very common Argument and Allegation, against the Opposers of Image-Worship. In answer to this, the Fathers of the 9th General Council (anno 794) said, 'There 'is but one Image or Representation of the 'Lord Christ, *τὸ μεγάλοιον ἐν ὑπόστασιν* 'Λόγου, *the Bread given to us in the Sacrament*. This Council consisted of 380 Fathers. But the Contrary Party at length prevailed; and it was concluded, both for the having and worshipping of Images, and by way of Supposition thereto, that the Sacrament is not the Sign, Image or Representation of Christ, but *true and very Christ*; the Bread and Wine after the Words of the Consecration (though they agree not, which are the Words of Consecration) being turned into the *the real Body and Blood of Christ*.

'Tis true the *Greeks* used not the word *Transubstantiation* (*Transubstantiatio*) till within this 500 Years, but they used equivalent words, *μετουσίωσις*, *μεταβολή*, *μετάστασις*, and such like. If any Wonder that such absurd and contradictory Doctrines, as the *Transubstantiation* and *the real Presence*, met with so little Opposition, in the Greek and Eastern Churches; such as one may make these two Reflections. First, that those Churches were led as it were by the Hand to those Doctrines, by certain Consequences from the

Doctrines,

Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, thus. There is a Trinity of Divine Persons, one of these was incarnate in the Womb of the Virgin; she is thereupon the Mother of GOD: if the Son of GOD is undoubtedly to be worship'd, then so too is the Mother of GOD; if Holy *Mary*, then others who were as much Saints as she; if Christ and the Saints, then for their Sakes their Images also, which are Signs of them. But Christ hath appointed the Sacramental Elements, as the only Signs of his Body: This is a Difficulty indeed: Therefore to defend Image-Worship, we will say, the Sacrament is not the Sign, but the very Body of Christ GOD-MAN. Secondly, it may be further considered, that these Churches having already swallowed so many palpable Contradictions to Reason, Scripture, and first Antiquity in the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation; they now stuck at nothing. It became now the Note and Mark of an *Heretick*, to talk of Absurdities and Contradictions, in any Doctrine whatsoever; and the Character of a Catholick or Orthodox Person, if one had no regard at all to such things, but only to help forward the Humour and Current of Superstition; that is, to believe *incredible Tales* about the Saints, and *monstrous Opinions* concerning GOD, and the Sacraments of the Church.

6. That the Holy Scriptures are not a *compleat Rule*, not sufficient to direct our Faith and Practice, without the Aid and Help of the Churches *Tradition*; all know is one of the Errors of the *Roman Catholick*, and which they could never yet be persuaded to give up. Ask them, what ground they have for such an Opinion? They answer as one Man; 'Tis notorious and undeniable that the principal Articles of the Christian Faith, the Trinity and Incarnation, cannot be proved by only Scripture. They profess openly and ingenuously, that the *Unitarians* have certainly beaten all their Opposers at those two Weapons, *mere Scripture* and *Reason*.

7. Another Birth of the Trinitarian Doctrine is the *Papal Indulgences*, with all that Merchandize of Souls that has followed upon them. First, and by way of Foundation it is supposed, that the Lord Christ is GOD as well as Man; and that he being GOD incarnate in our Nature, his Righteousness and Sufferings must needs be of infinite Value. Next it is held, that the Sufferings of Christ, who is GOD-MAN, and of the Saints, are *the Treasure which he hath given to the Church*; which Treasure is to be dispensed by his *Vicar*, even the *Pope* or Bishop of *Rome*. The Dispensations of this Treasure to particular Persons, by the Pope himself, or those who are by him authorized, are called *Indulgences*; and have been bought at mighty Rates, by those who thought they had need of them, either for themselves or their dead Friends.

8. The last of their Paradoxes which I shall now mention, and which is common to all Trinitarians, and is (by their own Confession) a necessary Consequence of the Incarnation, is their Doctrine of the *Satisfaction*.

The Holy Scriptures say, Almighty God of his Grace and Goodness doth pardon our Sins, on the Conditions of Faith and Repentance on our Parts. The Scriptures are so express in ascribing our Pardon and Deliverance from Hell and Damnation, to the Mercy and Grace of GOD forgiving us; that Trinitarians dare not directly deny it so to be: but then because they pretend that GOD was incarnate, and suffered in our stead, they are forced to this Conclusion, That God hath *freely pardoned*, and yet was *infinitely satisfied* for all our Transgressions and Sins. That of his *mere Grace*, the Abundance and *Riches of his Grace*, he will *pardon and save* the Penitent, because he hath received for them *a Price of Redemption*, able to redeem as many Worlds; as he is pleased to pardon or save particular Sinners.

These are the Branches growing upon the *Trinitarian* Stock; these the Fruits of that Tree: But such as the Fruits or Consequences of these Doctrines have been, such also was their Original and Extraction; as

we

we shall see in the next, which is our *sixth Reason* or Exception against them.

'They are of *Paganick* or *Heathen* Descent 'and Original, and were introduced into 'the Church by the *Platonick* Philosophers, 'when they came over to Christianity.'

One of our Disputes with the Trinitarians is concerning the Original of these Doctrines, from whom they are derived, or by whom they were invented? He that is generally (and indeed deservedly) confess'd to have written the most learnedly on this Subject, is D. *Cudworth*, in the *Intellectual System*. The Sum of what he saith, up and down, in that large Book in behalf of the Trinity, is this, 'The 'Christian Trinity is the very same with the 'Trinity of the *Platonick* Philosophers: Yet 'we are not to think, that the *Platonists* were 'the first Authors or Devisers of the Trinity: *Plato* learned it of *Parmenides*, *Parmenides* of the *Pythagoreans*, *Pythagoras* from '*Orpheus* and the Books of *Egyptian Hermes*, 'and other *Hermaic* Books, which Books 'contained the Arcane Theology of the *Egyptians*. The *Magick* or *Chaldaic* Oracles, 'and the *Mithraick* Mysteries, both of them 'derived from *Zoroaster* (a most ancient and 'sage King of the *Bactrians* and *Persians*) express also the Mystery of the Trinity. 'The *Romans* had their *Capitoline* Trinity, 'which they derived from the *Phrygians*, 'they from the *Samothracians*. This Consens of Philosophers and Nations makes it more than probable, and no less than certain, that the Trinity was no humane Invention, *for how should so many jump in the 'same groundless Conceit*; but a Theology of 'Divine Original, even a Part of the *Cabala* 'Tradition or oral Law of the *Jews*, which 'they had from *Moses*, and he from GOD, 'which also is the Opinion of *Eusebius* and 'Theodoret, the ablest Historians and Antiquaries of the Primitive Church.

To make up weight I will fling into the Scale three Authorities, altogether as considerable and authentick, as any of these alledged by Dr. *Cudworth*. Let them take the *Grecian* Trinity, which is much older than the *Roman*, *Phrygian* or *Samothracian*: Let them take the Books of *Hystaspes*, another most ancient and sage King of the *Medes*; which Books are celebrated by *Lactantius*, and other Fathers. We will also give them the *Sybillin* Oracles or Verses, which speak so expressly of the Father, Son, and Spirit, and even of the Incarnation, that no *Trinitarian* or *Arian* can deliver himself more explicitly or evidently.

He saith, 'How should so many Philosophers and Nations jump in the same groundless Conceit? Therefore the Trinity is a 'part of the Jewish *Cabala* or Oral Law, and 'was from them borrowed by other Nations, 'and by the Philosophers. I omit that the Nations and Philosophers by him mentioned are but few: But all Men know, there was an incomparably greater Consent of Nations and Philosophers in Polytheism, *or the Acknowledgment and Worship of many distinct Gods*. And that Consideration should have made this learned Author aware, that a surprizing Consent of *many* is not always the Effect of a *divine Tradition*, but too often of a *diabolical Suggestion*, or other Causes.

Again, (supposing the aforesaid Consent of Philosophers and Nations) yet 'tis very odly father'd by a *Protestant* Divine, on a *Cabala* Tradition or Oral Law of the *Jews*. 'Tis one of the Principles of us Protestants, to disclaim all (pretended) *Cabala's* and Traditions, whether of *Jews* or *Christians*; and to believe there never was any other Divine Tradition, but only the Books of the Old and New Testaments.

I am ready to dispute this Point at large with any of our Opposers, whenever they shall think fit again to insist on it. In the mean time, I take notice, that indeed the *Pharisees* having devised of their own Heads divers *Doctrines* and *Rites*; to give them the greater Authority, they called them Traditions, and pretended they were a *Cabala* or Oral Law, delivered originally by *Moses*. But the founder part of the *Jews* themselves, even all the *Karaites* disown any such Tradition or Law. And our Saviour, whose Authority

rity I hope may be equivalent to *Eusebius* or *Theodoret*, calls these Tradicions and this (pretended) Law, not *a Theology of divine Original*, but *Doctrines and Commandments of Men*, Matth. 15. 6, 9. Nor is there any mention or least Intimation of such a *Cabala* or Law, in any of the Books of the Old Testament. And it seems incredible, that among so many of the *Holy* Writers there should be no where found so much as any Allusion to their *Cabala*, if indeed they had acknowledged or known of any such thing: Why did not *Esdras*, when he collected into one, the scattered and dispersed Canon of Scripture, without omitting the *Proverbs* of *Solomon*, and others, or his Book of *Love*; why did he not at the same time commit to Writing, and publish the Divine *Cabala*, of so much more *Authority* and *Consequence*, than divers Pieces by him published and added to *the Law*?

Furthermore, admitting the (pretended) aforesaid Consent of some Philosophers and Nations, and also a Tradition, *Cabala*, or oral Law of the *Jews*: yet 'tis certain the Trinity is no part of that *Cabala*. For all the World knows that the *Jews*, though they strictly adhere to their *Cabala*, yet are so far from acknowledging a Trinity, that this Doctrine is the very Stumbling-block which hinders their entring into the Church. That whole Nation, and all the Sects of them, hold the Christians to be Polytheists and Idolaters, on the Account of the Doctrine of the Trinity. They pronounce Christianity to be a much worse Idolatry than *Jeroboam's* Calves: Which were not two fictitious Gods added to the true one; but only Images of the *Cherubims*, as the *Cherubims* were Hieroglyfick Resemblances of the one true GOD. So that though the *ten* Tribes were guilty of a kind of Idolatry, by their worshipping the true GOD under forbidden Resemblances, (for though the *Cherubims* themselves were set up by GOD's Order; yet not for Worship, or to common Sight) they were not *Polytheists*; they owned with all the rest of the *Jews*, but one Divine Person.

I doubt not, Sir, but that you perceive, that the whole Force of Dr. *Cudworth's* Argument, from the (supposed) Consent of some Nations and Philosophers, is enervated; and that such (pretended) Consent, notwithstanding the Trinity, is not (as he says) *a Theology of Divine Tradition*, but merely and solely of *Paganick and Heathen Extraction*; and brought into the Christian Church by the *Platonick* Philosophers, when they came over to Christianity.

I could now tell you, Sir, that whereas Dr. *Cudworth* brings in his *Philosophers*, *Oracles*, *Kings* and *Nations*, as believing and asserting the Trinity; even in the dark times of Heathenism: this is all *mere Flourish* and *Rhodomontade*. For, first, as to the Books of *Hermes*, *Zoroaster*, and *Hystaspes*, as also the *Sybilin* and *Chaldaic* or *Magick* Oracles, they are all of them Forgeries, partly of the Jews, a little before the Nativity of our Saviour, partly of the Christians of the second and third Centuries. And this is so generally agreed, and so clearly demonstrated by the *Critiques*, that I was extreamly surprized to see such Authorities alledged in a Book written by Dr. *Cudworth*, a Man (if any other) of true and real Learning. But so it is, that in the Defect of genuine and solid Proofs, the most Learned must have recourse to such as their Cause will afford. Next, as to the Nations and Philosophers by him mentioned; the Authors that knew those Nations and Writers, better than at this Distance of time we now can; particularly the most learned *Plutarch* and *Lactius*; these Authors say, that those Philosophers and Nations did not hold a Trinity, but a Duality of Principles or Gods, that is, a good and a bad GOD. And by what they say of those Gods or Principles, they seem to mean no more than what we are taught in Holy Scripture, concerning GOD and that malign (but subordinate) Spirit called *the Devil* and *Satan*.

But you will say, the *Platonists* held a Trinity of Divine Persons. Yes, some of them did: I say some of them; for the more learned *Platonists* (such as *Jamblichus*, *Proclus*, and

and *Plato* himself) did not think their (imagin'd) Trinity to be the supream GOD; but that over their Trinity there is one most simple *Monadick* or *solitary Being*, who is GOD of Gods, and the first Author of all things. If you ask, How the *vulgar Platonists* came to stumble upon a Trinity? I answer; They finding that the first Philosophers had called GOD, *Hen* and *Tagathon*, or *the One* and *the Good*; as also *Logos Nous* and *Sophia*, or *the Reason* (or WORD) *the Mind* and *Wisdom*: And finally, *Psyche*, *the Soul*, because he pervades and governs the World, as the Soul does the Body: They being the most fanciful and Enthusiastical of all Men, exceeding the *Quakers* in Enthusiasm, and the *Behmenists* in *Fancifulness* and *Affectation of Mystery*; mistook the aforementioned *Properties* of the Divine Nature for Persons, or wilfully and affectedly *allegoriz'd* them into *Persons*. *Hen* and *Tagathon* (*the One* and *the Good*) they made to be the same, even the Father and Fountain of the Deity; because all Number proceeds from *One* or *Unity*; and because *Goodness* (as these Philosophers often speak) is better than *Reason* or *Wisdom*. *Nous*, *Logos*, and *Sophia*, (that is, Mind, Reason, and Wisdom) being but equivalent Words, of these they made the second Person; or (as some of them call him) *the Son*. *Psyche*, or the Mundane *Soul* was the third; because *Reason* or *Wisdom* is better than, and superiour to all things but *Tagathon* or *Goodness*.

There is, Sir, a certain Fate always attending on Error, by which she is first or last betrayed and exposed, even by those who seek to maintain and defend her. Therefore though Dr. *Cudworth* hath spent so many Sheets in discovering a Trinity among several Philosophers and Nations more ancient than the Platonists, yet he hath somewhere unsaid all again, and confess'd that the *Platonick* Trinity was nothing but an Affectation or *Blunder* of those Philosophers; and as I just now said, either their *Mistake* or their *Exchange* of the *Properties* of the Divine Nature, for so many Divine *Persons*. His own Words (at *p.* 206 of the *Intel. System*) are these; 'We have proposed the three 'principal *Properties* or Attributes of the Deity. The first whereof is infinite GOOD-'NESS with Fecundity; the second infinite 'WISDOM or Knowledg; the third infinite '*active* and *perceptive POWER*. From which 'three Divine Attributes and Properties, 'the *Pythagorians* and *Platonists* seem to have 'framed their *Trinity*. So at length this learned Person hath given it up to us, after so great Endeavours to prove the contrary, that the Trinity is of mere *Paganick* and *Heathen* Original, the *Device* or the *Mistake* of the *Platonists*.

Our *last Exception* or *Reason* is this.

'As the Trinity, when first brought into 'the Church by the *Platonists*, did by its na-'tural Absurdity and Impossibility, give a 'Check and Stop to the Progress of the Go-'spel; so ever since it has served to propa-'gate *Deism* and *Atheism*, and to hinder the 'Conversion of the *Jews* and *Mahometans*, 'and the *Heathen* Nations not yet turned to 'Christianity.

You cannot, Sir, expect in a single Letter, a large and ample Proof of this Assertion of mine: but however I will say hereupon enough to convince you, or any other unprejudic'd Person, that I am able to make such a Proof of it (whenever it shall be denied by our Opposers) as will very much surprize the Idolaters of these Doctrines.

For the first Part of this Assertion, I will now content my self with the plain Acknowledgment of *Lactantius*, *Instit. l.* 4. *c.* 29. This learned and eloquent *Father*, disputing concerning these very Doctrines, says, *Fortasse quærat hic aliquis, &c.* 'Here some one 'may perhaps ask, How, though Christians 'profess to worship but one GOD, yet we 'seem to believe and hold two Gods, GOD 'the Father, and GOD the Son? *This Doctrine* '*hath been a great Stumbling-block to many*, who 'confess that in other Points of the Christian 'Doctrine, we speak what is probable and fit 'to be imbraced, but in this they think we 'fumble, that we hold a second GOD, and 'him also a mortal one, or one who could die.

 You

You may please, Sir, here to take notice, that the Reason why *Lactantius* mentions only two Gods, the Father and the Son; was because the Divinity of the Holy Spirit was not yet believed, or (I think) so much as mentioned by any. The Council of *Nice* it self durst not say the Holy Ghost is GOD; no, nor the Council of *Constantinople* in express Terms: For as *Petavius* has noted the Party of the *Pneumatomachi* (*i. e.* those who denied the Divinity of the Spirit) were yet the more powerful Party in the Church. *D. Petav. de Trin. l.* 1. *c.* 14. *s.* 14, and 21. See also *Huetius, Origenian. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *q.* 2. *sect.* 10.

As to *Deism* and *Atheism:* Some (otherways discerning Men) have not Judgment enough to distinguish between the *corrupted* and the *sincere* Parts of Religion, but they consider the whole of Religion together, and judg it to be all of it *false*, or all *true*. From these two sorts of Men proceed all the *Deists*, and most, if not all *Atheists*. The Atheist rejects all Religion whatsoever, for the sake of some unaccountable and absurd things, which vulgarly pass for the principal Articles of Religion. The Deist, far more judicious, rejects hereupon only all positive or *revealed* Religion, and takes up with natural Religion, *i. e.* with the Belief of a GOD, whose Power and Wisdom he plainly sees in the *Structure* and *Contrivance* of the World, and with the Dictates of Reason, and our congenit and natural Notions concerning moral and immoral, or good and evil.

This, Sir, is not a Place to argue either against the Deist or Atheist; I had here only to observe, that from the absurd Corruptions of true Religion, by *injudicious* or *fanciful* Men, have and do arise all the Deism, and most part of the Atheism with which our Age is infested.

There is so much the more Reason for our utmost Indeavours, to withstand the farther Progress of those two, Deism and that Pest of Atheism, by purging Religion of all the contradictory and impossible Doctrines which give occasion to those Mistakes, because Christianity has already lost so much ground to *Mahometism* or *Turcism*. *Mahomet* is affirmed by divers Historians, to have had no other Design in pretending himself to be a Prophet, but to restore the Belief of *the Unity of GOD*, which at that time was extirpated among the Eastern Christians, by the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation. They will have it, that *Mahomet* meant not his Religion should be esteemed a new Religion, but only the Restitution of the true Intent of the Christian Religion. They affirm moreover, that the *Mahometan* learned Men call themselves the *true* Disciples of the *Messias* or Christ; intimated thereby that Christians are Apostates from the most essential Parts of the Doctrine of the *Messias*; such as the Unity of GOD; and that he is to be worshipp'd without Images or Pictures, in Spirit and in Truth. But whatsoever the Design of *Mahomet* was, 'tis certain *Mahometism* has prevailed over greater Numbers and more Nations, than at this Day profess Christianity: Nay, it has worn Christianity out of great part of *Europe*, most of *Asia*, and all Roman *Africa*; not by Force and the Sword, for the *Mahometans* grant Liberty of Religion to all the conquered Provinces of Christians; but by that one Truth in the *Alchoran*, the Unity of GOD. The *Naturalness* of their Belief of the Unity of God, and the unreconcilable Inconsistence of the Trinity with that Belief, make it impossible ever to reconcile the *Mahometans* (whether *Turks*, *Moors*, or *Persians*) to Christianity. This is that by which both they and the *Jews* are perpetually and without Hope of regaining them, alienated from us, that they suppose the Trinity to be the Doctrine of all Christians; and from thence conclude, that *modern* Christianity is no better nor other than a sort of *Paganism* and *Heathenism*.

The Nations also who are yet *Pagans*, reject Christianity for the sake of the corrupt Doctrines against which we are arguing. Of this there has been a calamitous Instance in the *Tartars*. This warlike People, who have made themselves so terrible by their *Cavalry*, to the great Kingdoms of *Poland* and *Muscovy*,

ny, and even to *Germany* it self, were lost to Christianity by Occasion of the Doctrines of the Trinity, *&c.* In the Year 1246, Pope *Innocent* IV sent an Ambassage to *Bati* Cham of *Tartary*, inviting him to the Christian Religion: *Bati* received the Ambassage civilly; but when he heard from *the Religious* sent to instruct him, what were the chief Points of the Christian Faith, the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Transubstantiation, *&c.* He thank'd the Pope for his Kindness, and promised to make no Incursions into the Christian Countries for five Years next insuing; but withal declared himself not satisfied with the Christian Religion, as represented to him. Immediately after the *Saracens* sent a like Ambassage to *Bati*, recommending to him (saith the Historian) *Mahometis sectam tanquàm plausibiliorem*, i. e. *The more plausible Sect of* Mahomet: And these prevailed, *Bati* and the whole Nation of the *Tartars* submitting to *Mahometism*, in which they continue to this Day, and are both the *Shield* and *Sword* of that way of acknowledging and worshipping GOD. *L. Surius Comment. rerum in Orbe Gest.*

These, Sir, are the Damages sustained by Christianity, by occasion of these Doctrines: I believe by that time you have well considered them, you will conclude, these Doctrines will never repair half the Wastes they have already made in our Holy Religion; and that they are honest Men who are jealous of, and desirous to inquire very strictly into the Grounds of such *Paradoxical* Perswasions as have already given such deep Wounds to our common Cause of Christianity.

I will conclude, Sir, for this time, with only telling you, that the *Reasons* I have given, might *all* of them have been much *amplified* and *illustrated*; and *some* of them greatly *exaggerated*. But that is a Design hardly practicable in a Letter; the Brevity of a Letter even constrained me to lay before you what I had to say in *few* Words, and in a *plain* and *sincere* Discourse, without the Arts or Pomp of Rhetorick. Nor am I offended at it; for our Cause needs not those Helps. Till our Opposers can extinguish Reason and common Sense in Men; while there are any left who are not wholly Priest-ridden, who have not abandoned the Conduct and Guidance of *Reason* and *natural Knowledg* for that of a *Confessor*, that is to say, *a Divine Light* for an *Ignis fatuus*, or *Will-a-wisp*: So long (I think) we need not be very sollicitous, whether our Discourses or Writings concerning these Doctrines, be altogether so *laboured* and *artificial*, as our Opposers must take Care that theirs are.

S I R,

I am your most

Obliged and Assured.

F I N I S.

Two Letters touching the Trinity *and* Incarnation. *The First urging the Belief of the Athanasian Creed. The Second, an Answer thereto.*

The First LETTER.

Loving Cousin;

IT'S no small Trouble to me to hear you are fallen into the *horrid* Heresy of the Socinians and Arians, *viz.* to deny the Holy Trinity and Incarnation of our Saviour: For you commend a printed Sheet, that is dispersed under the Title of *Brief Notes on the Creed of St.* Athanasius, and are not afraid of the Damnation which is there pronounced against all such as do not firmly believe the Doctrines contained therein, which have been always and are at this Day held to be the *Great Fundamentals of Christianity.* And I take them to be so clearly revealed in Holy Scripture, that no Man well acquainted with Scripture, (as you are) can disbelieve them, without some *Wantonness and Pride of Understanding, a great Conceit and Confidence of their own Knowledge, and such unpardonable Immodesty, as admits of no Excuse: And though such Persons may be otherwise pious and useful Men, yet there's no Reason why they should not be damned as well as devout and vertuous Jews and Heathens.*

I always took you for a *modest Man*, and one that had a great Reverence for what is revealed in Holy Scripture. But if you now *resolve never to allow that to be the Sense of the Revelation, however plain and evident the Words are, which is not agreable to your Reason, but will put another Sense upon them, though never so forc'd and violent*, as in this Controversy you do; I can no longer account you modest, but that you now betray the Pride and Conceitedness, which before lay hid, and that if you persist in the Denial of the supream Divinity of the Son of God and of the Holy Ghost, you are to be rejected of all good Christians as an Heretick, *one that is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself.* For that it is not consistent with any Man, but him that has long indulged in himself that Arrogance and Singularity which stops his Ears to sober Truth, and shuts out of his Heart the Fear and Awe of God, or at least never sets himself seriously before the Divine Tribunal in the Consideration of these Matters (as I am perswaded besals some heady and hot Controvertists) to shut his Eyes against *the Meridian Light* of these *necessary* Doctrines, the Foundation of Christian Religion as it is Christian. For *the Mystery of the Trinity runs through it, and gives it all the Strokes of Life and Greatness*, as it is a positive Religion different from natural. I beseech you therefore, Cousin, retire your self into your own Heart, and set our Lord Jesus upon his Throne before your Eyes, and consider what you will answer to him, whom you have denied to be your God, and say he is but a made Lord, and that as a Mediator he is not God-Man, but Man only; and concerning the Holy Ghost,

in whose Name you are baptized as well as in the Father and the Son, you yet deny him to be another Divine and Almighty Person. Consider, I pray, that *the Doctrine of the Trinity is not a speculative Point, but that the whole Frame of Christianity is built upon it, and that it is necessary to support both our Christian Worship, and our Christian Hope and Comfort.* Consider also that all Heresies are *Works of the Flesh*, which notwithstanding many great Bishops, and some great Councils have been guilty of, even in this Point denying of three equal Persons in God: And we know, that for many Ages the Church of *Rome* has maintained the gross Heresies of Transubstantiation, and Idolatrous Worship of the Host, with many other Superstitions; all which shew that our corrupted Wills and Passions are as inclinable to Heresy and Superstition as to other Vices and Immoralities. *Faith is a Christian Virtue, and a Man shall be punished for the Faults of his Understanding as well as any others. We must be as careful then to bring our Reason to whatever is divinely inspired, as our Will to whatever is divinely commanded.* I beseech you therefore again and again, examine your Conscience seriously, and the Holy Scripture sincerely. Do not impose upon your self to your own Destruction, by uncouth, nice, unintelligible and trifling Distinctions, for God will not be mocked. Sincerity is necessary to every good Christian, and they that want it shall have their Portion with Hypocrites and Sinners. As you hearken to this altogether necessary Advice, you shall have me,

Your Condoling, or

Congratulating Kinsman.

The ANSWER.

Dear Cousin;

AS I was meditating on the little or no care Christians take of their own Salvation, that unhappy Carelessness afforded me the true Reason of their being so little concerned for the Salvation of their Neighbours: I am glad to hear you are not of that Number, and I don't question but you will be pleased that I am none of them neither, and that following your Example, I desire your Salvation with as much Earnestness as you do mine. Most of those whom the Church has set up for the Conduct of Souls, are much more earnest to get Preferments, and defend the Party wherein they are ingaged, by furious Disputes and violent Persecutions, than sincerely to examine the Doctrines which they teach, and feed their Flocks with those pure and solid Truths, which free from Sin and Error: Nor do they think that thereby they become accountable before God's Tribunal for all the Wandrings of their Disciples. And lastly, that both the blind Guide, and the Blind whom he guides, shall fall into the Ditch. Do but separate from their Study, whatever is profane, and belongs not to the Character of a Pastor, and the Treasure of their Minds will soon be exhausted; therefore imitate them not in such a Disorder. For my part, though I am a *Layman*, I think I am bound earnestly to exhort my Brethren and you particularly, to restore the Principle of our Reformation, which is almost degenerated into Popery; and to make use of *our own Light*, that we may be able to keep the Way set before us in the Scripture: This is the Protestants Right, we are in Possession thereof, and we must not suffer our selves to be deprived of it.

I beseech you, dear Cousin, in the Name of God, to consider, that when we were first delivered from the Roman Tyranny, we inveighed

veighed against the absurd Doctrines, that were imposed upon our Faith, we cried down the Word of Men, and recommended only the Word of God, *the Bible, the Bible, the Bible* only, says *Chillingworth*. But we no sooner got out of our former Slavery, by the help of so clear a Light; but we are fallen into a new one by a most unequal Conduct. The Question is no more concerning the pure Word of God; it is, say they, too equivocal and uncertain, and it is no hard Matter for Hereticks to make it agree with their particular Opinions. What then? we hear of nothing but Fathers, Tradition, Councils, Creeds, and new-coined Words, on purpose to keep Christians within the Bounds of the Faith of their Ancestors; Metaphysical Terms, whereof Men have no fixed Notion, and yet they stop the Mouths of Hereticks, by making the Church speak more clearly and reasonably than the Holy Ghost did. But this is not all; some of the same Men who inveighed so much against the Inquisition and Popish Violences, set up among themselves a Holy Inquisition, and will hear of no Toleration, but oppress the Liberty of the Christians, who dare speak out their Mind, so far are they from venturing on Writings and a publick Profession. One would think that by our many Disputes with the Roman Church, concerning Infallibility, we have acquired the Privilege thereof to our selves.

Give me leave therefore, dear Cousin, since you call me to God's Tribunal, to summon you to the same. Pray tell me, Ought we not to fear that God should require from us the Truth of the Holy Scripture, with which we have been intrusted; that Light which we have put under a Bushel, and his gracious Talent, which we have buried? If he asks, from whence we took those *profane Novelties of a Science justly so called*, I mean that most strange and barbarous Language in his Church, *O Holy, Blessed and Glorious Trinity, three Persons and one God, have mercy upon us*; What shall we answer him? What if he shall oblige us to give an Account of our Faith of that monstrous Creed of *Athanasius*, with which we honour our great Holy Days, and which you mention as the most illustrious Monument of the Faith of our Fathers. Where is the Scribe, where is the Philosopher of this World, that can answer him to one of those many nonsensical Articles? How came ye, will he say, to find in my Word *one Essence and three Persons, rather than one Person and three Essences?* By what Partiality have you discovered a Figure in these Words, *This is my Body*, and have found none in these, *The Word was God?* Why did you distinguish two Natures in the Christ, whom I sent you, whilst you refused to admit of two sorts of *Being* in the Sacramental Body, which he gave you? You were afraid of those Words, *To eat the Flesh, and drink the Blood of the Son of God*; and you had no Repugnancy for the literal Sense of these, *A Virgin brought forth God; The Jews crucified God?* He can ask a thousand such Questions, to which we shall be able to give no reasonable Answer, by reason of the Inequality of the Reverence we pretend to pay to his Word, and of our Unreadiness in the Use we make of our Reason and Senses.

In Effect, I would fain have our Teachers to tell us by what Principle of Philosophy, by what Rule of Language, that Conclusion is right and necessary, *viz.* the Father is a Divine Person, the Son is a Divine Person, the Holy Ghost is a Divine Person; *Therefore there are three Divine Persons*: and this should not likewise be so; The Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost is God; *Therefore there are three Gods?* Doth not common Reason tell us, that those two Conclusions are like this? *Gabriel, Raphael*, and *Michael*, are three Angelical Persons; *therefore they are three Angels?* The same might be said of *Peter, James* and *John*, who are both three humane Persons, and three Men. This Principle of natural Reason ought to prevail, unless we are taught by the Scripture, that three Divine Persons are not the same with three Gods, or that a God is three Persons, and three Persons a God. But where doth it

it tell us so? What Texts can they alledg that are clearer to prove that Mystery, than those alledged by the Papists are, to prove their supposed Mystery of one Christ and many Bodies, and of many Bodies and one Christ? How is it that with respect to the Sacrament, we are helped by our Senses to put a reasonable Sense upon the Scripture; but with respect to the Trinity, Reason forsakes us so far, as to ascribe to Scripture an absurd Sense, and contrary to its Simplicity? Is the Light of a sensible Man more certain than that of an understanding and reasonable Man? Have we a greater Certainty, that a Piece of Bread is not a humane Body, than that two and one make three? Is the Mystery of Christ's Sacramental Body more suitable to our Apprehension, than the Mystery of his real and natural Body? How come we to know that there is something that is incomprehensible in that Man, whom we see born and dead, and that there is no such thing in the Bread which we take and eat? A God is joined to that, say ye, and why not to this? But we see still some Bread, will ye reply. It is true, your Senses do not deceive you; But have not the Apostles too seen with their Eyes, and touched with their Hands, the Man, who is called the Word of Life? and their Senses have not deceived them. This is true, who can doubt of it? How shall we come off? Shall we fly to another Nature hypostatically united to this, which is the Object of our Senses? But then the Heretics, who err about the Sacrament, may have Recourse to the same Shift, to avoid the Testimony of the Senses. Some will say that the Senses can judg only of the Species which remain in the Sacrament; Some, that there is an invisible Object in the Bread, which is the glorious Body of Christ; Some, that there is an hypostatical Union of that Bread with the eternal Word, which raises the Mystery so much above our Reason, that it loses thereby the Right and Liberty of judging thereof, and lies under the Necessity of submitting to the Authority of the Revelation, which is, clear upon this Point; for it says, *This is my Body.* Now if our Reason is rash in the Judgment it bears concerning the Incarnation, notwithstanding the Evidence of the literal Sense of the Scripture, which is on her side; what Rashness will it not be to interpose her Judgment in the Mysteries of Consubstantiation and Transubstantiation, against the express Revelation of God's Word, *This is my Body?*

I will only ask you one Question upon this Matter, and I desire you to answer me in the Fear of God, and the Sincerity of your Heart. Why do you think you may with Dr. *Wallis* say, that the Terms of *Person*, *Father*, *Son*, *Begotten*, &c. are metaphorical, whilst you cannot endure that those you call Hereticks should use the same Right, and according to Reason and Scripture, pretend likewise that the Title of *God* ascribed to Christ, is also a metaphorical Expression? Can any thing be more unjust? Furthermore, why do you take the Liberty to explain the Words of the Eucharist thus, *This Bread is the Representation and the Figure of my Body?* And why do you deny me at the same time the same Liberty, when I explain the Words in the Beginning of St. *John's* Gospel by these, *And the Word was the Image of God?* Your Injustice is so much the greater, because I may ground my Interpretation upon other Expressions of the Scripture, wherein Christ is formally called the Image of God, and because you have no express Texts of the same Scripture wherein the Sacramental Bread is called the Figure of Christ's Body. Now neither in my Proposition nor in yours, the Image cannot be the Original. As the Bread hath but a Conformity of Qualities with Christ's Body, not the same Qualities, and the same Substance: Thus Christ, as he is the Image of God, cannot have the same Qualities nor the same Nature with God: He only hath the Impression of the Divine Substance, which God hath communicated to him, by honouring him with his Unction, bearing Testimony to him, and crowning him with Glory as a Reward of his Sufferings; *Because he humbled himself to*

the

the Death of the Cross, therefore the Father hath highly exalted him, and hath given him a Name which is above every Name. Now if Christ hath been dignified with that high Name, by reason of his Obedience and Vertue, it follows from thence, that he had it not by the Priviledg of his eternal Generation: For if so, the pompous Description of Christ's Elevation set down in the Gospel would be but a Shew and mere Pageantry.

Therefore, dear Cousin, if you find in those clear Texts of the Scripture the true Reason of Christ's being called God; believe me, do not fetch any other from the extravagant Notions of the Athanasian Creed, wherein neither you nor I can apprehend any thing, except we apprehend nothing. Notwithstanding you are so bold as to pronounce against me a Sentence of Damnation upon the Words of that doting Writer, (who was not *Athanasius*) and even to damn all those who will give no Credit to his Ravings, let them be never so pious and charitable. O strange Prejudice of Men! As for me i'le make bold likewise to tell you, that how false and ill grounded soever the Assurance of Salvation may be, which that Author promises to those that believe his Visions, it is yet more false, that those good Christians who refuse to believe them, shall be damned. For there is nothing more certain and clear in the Gospel than this, *viz.* That all honest and pious Men shall be saved, and that all those who shall be saved, will be saved without believing the curious Mysteries of the pretended *Athanasius*. Do but peruse all the Evangelical Promises, and look if you can find any one that promises Salvation to those who believe *the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity*; I can shew you a thousand which make Salvation sure to Piety, or to a Faith inconsistent with the Faith of *Athanasius*. What Guide shall we then follow, this *Creed* which says, That *whosoever will be saved, ought to believe three Divine Persons, and one Divine Essence*, or *Christ*, who assures us, that *eternal Life consists in acknowledging his Father the only true God, and himself Christ Jesus to be he whom the Father hath sent*, that is to say, the Messias? What Creed shall we pitch upon to be the Badg of our Christianity, either the new ones, which speak of *God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, as three equal Persons*, or the ancient Creed of the universal Church, commonly called the Apostles Creed, which only speaks of *God the Father, Jesus Christ his Son, and the Holy Ghost*, without giving the Title of *God* to these two last? and which expresly ascribing to the Father the Attributes of the Godhead, of *Almighty, Maker of Heavin and Earth*; ascribes only to the Son that which is only consistent with a Man, and cannot be ascribed to the supream God without Blasphemy, *viz.* That *he was conceived, born, died, was buried, and raised?*

Now as it is not the Language of the Apostles Creed, to say, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; so it is neither the Stile of the Scripture, which never gives the Title of God to Christ, when it joins him with the Father, in those Places wherein it sets before us the Objects of our Knowledg and Worship, and makes, as it were, a kind of Form or Confession of Faith. The Reason of it is this, Christ is God with Respect to the Empire which he hath received from God over the new Creatures, which he hath taken out of the Chaos of Sin, and governs by his Father's Power: But with Respect to God his Father, he is only the Minister of his Will, his Messenger; and is at most called *the Lord*, which is a Term of Inferiority in the New Testament, to denote him whom the Father hath made his Lieutenant, who hath received his Empire from another, and is to deliver it to him, that intrusted him with it; *God*, say the Holy Apostles, *having made him Lord and Christ*. According to this Rule, which the Scripture exactly follows, it doth not only deny the Title of God to Christ in the Abridgments of Faith which it affords; but it is wont to ascribe it only to the Father exclusively of the Son, saying expresly, that *the Father is the only true God*, and *the Son the only Lord*; as often

often as it puts together those two Objects of our Faith. And in this remarkable Opposition it is that we are to look for the true Sense of the Scripture about this Mystery; not in those other Places wherein it doth not affect the same Exactness. Here, dear Cousin, I intreat you again, if you are a true Lover of Truth, seriously to consider those Texts of the Gospel upon which my Remark is grounded. *This is Life eternal*, says Christ to his Father, *to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. But to us*, says St. *Paul*, *There is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things; and we by him. One God*, says the same Apostle, *and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus.* Where is the Trinitarian, who on such an occasion would not say, *One God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost?* yet there is no mention made of the Holy Ghost; and as for the Son he bears only the Title of *sent*, *Lord* and *Mediator*, that of *God* being not at all bestowed upon him in those Places? Who is the Trinitarian that would not say on the last cited Place, *One God, and one Mediator between God and Men, Christ God-man?* But *God-man* is too barbarous an Expression, and the Holy Ghost is too wise to make such a Conjunction. Lastly, who is the Trinitarian, who would call the Father, *the only God, the only true God*, to distinguish him from the Son, by opposing God to Man, the only God to the only Lord and Mediator, in a Word, the Father to the Son, and one Person to another? Do they not pretend that the Father cannot be called the only true God, but by Opposition to the false Gods of the Heathens? But the Holy Apostle doth not only oppose him to the Idols of the Pagans, as the true one to the false ones, but to the only Lord, whom Christians worship; insmuch as God by Excellence, God by himself, is opposed to the inferior and subordinate Gods, whom he hath made such out of his Grace and Liberality, *I said, ye are Gods: But to us*, says the Holy Apostle, to us Christians, *there is but one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ*: Two Objects of our Faith really distinguished; the one by the Name of *one only God*, the other by the Title of *one only Lord*. From whence it follows, as I have already said, that Christ indeed is God, or rather a God, if considered as the Head of all the new Creatures, which God hath subjected to his Empire; but when joined to the Father, this Title vanishes away, and he bears only that of his Minister and Ambassador; so true it is, that before the true and supreme God, any other God besides him must fall and disappear.

You accuse me of wresting the Scripture, yet you see how I have brought you to the Necessity of putting a hard Sense upon it, if you will maintain your Hypothesis. The Texts that I alledg to you are clear and formal, and you cannot avoid the Strength of them, but either by a Philosophy altogether incomprehensible, or by some gross and contradictory Shifts, or by a pitiful Wrangling, or even by Impiety and Blasphemies. The Number of such Shifts is endless, and I shall be contented to bring an Instance about every one of those, which I have just now intimated. When we alledg that Croud of Texts, which say, that God is *one*, you fly to that famous Distinction of *one Essence and three Persons, and three Persons and one Essence*. If at the same time we alledg those primitive Facts of the Gospel, wherein we see a most exact History, not of *a God*, but of *a Man* like unto us, who was born, died, and was raised; you answer with another Distinction of *two Natures and one Person, and one Person and two Natures*. This is your *incomprehensible Philosophy*, which will have *one* to be *three times one*, three times himself; and pretends that by Virtue of I know not what hypostatical Union, a Man is the supreme God, and the supreme God a Man; so that it may be said, *The most high God was born, the most high God died*. O! Who shall raise him from the dead? Again when we shew that the Question concerning Christ's Divinity was decided by himself before the Jews, who accused him that being a Man, he made him-

self equal to God; when one shews you, I say, that Christ vindicates himself from Blasphemy, by professing that he said he was the Son of God, only in such a Sense as is approved by the Law, founding his Right, not upon an eternal Generation, but upon a Heavenly Commission and Unction, just as the other Gods, whose Example he alledges, *If those are called Gods, to whom the Word of God came, &c. say ye that I blaspheme, because I said, I am the Son of God?* When one sets before you so clear a Decision, and at the same time so favourable to those you call Heretricks, how do you make shift? You say that Christ spake only according to the Need of the Jews, that there was no Necessity for him to give them further Instructions. Yet at the same time that you return this curious Answer, which supposes that it was enough for the Jews, that Christ should teach them, that he was *a God by Office*, you make an Objection taken out of the same Discourse of Christ, wherein you present that he told the Jews he was *God by Nature*, when he says, *that he and the Father were one*, which Words you insist upon to prove the Unity of Nature. This I call your *gross and contradictory shifts*. Again, when one cites the famous Text of St. *John's* Gospel, wherein Christ makes *eternal Life to consist in knowing the Father the only true God, &c.* What do you answer to so strong an Objection? You put upon those Words a most forced and unnatural Sense, and say that they ought to be translated thus, *This is Life eternal, to know that thou Father and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent, are the only true God.* This I call your *rash and impertinent Wrangling*. In effect you are so bold as to make use of this in your Disputes, to make shift as well as you can. But none of your Orthodox Translations durst take the same Liberty, neither the Latin, nor the English, nor the French, nor the German, nor the Dutch, *&c.* And I am sure that if you would undertake a new Translation, you have still Modesty enough not to fly to so shameful an Extremity. Lastly, (for I should never have done, were I willing to insist upon every thing) when one shews you in the 13*th* Chapter of St. *Mark*, that Christ is not the most high God, since he was ignorant of the Day of Judgment, (for God knows all things) *of that Day*, says Christ, *no Man knoweth it, not the Son, but the Father only.* In answer to this unanswerable Objection, you put into Christ's Mouth *a Jesuitical Equivocation*, pretending his meaning was, that he knew it not *as a Man*, though he knew it well *as God*. This I call your *Impiety and Blasphemy*. Methinks, dear Cousin, you should blush to impute to Christ *a mental Reservation*, which you so much detest in the Priests of the Church of *Rome*. Read Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his Sermon upon *Matth.* 10. 16. *pag.* 31, 32. The common Answer, says he, (speaking of those Priests Equivocations) is, *That in Confession the Priest doth not know as Man, but as God, and therefore when he is asked any thing as a Man, he may deny what he knows as God.* But the Doctor shews the Folly and Absurdity of this Answer, "Because, says he, this "doth not salve the Contradiction; for to "say, *he doth not know*, is as much as to say, "*he doth not any way know it*, which is false, "if he doth know it *in any Capacity*, because "he knows it *as a Priest*, and as such he is "not God, but Man. Give me leave therefore to look upon the Words you put into the Mouth of Christ, who is Truth itself, as an Impiety and a Folly. *He doth not know it*, signifies that *he doth not any way know it*, which is false, if he knows it *in any Capacity*. Furthermore, it is false, that he doth not know it *as Man*, since he knows it *as Mediator*, and as such he is not only God, but *God and Man*, say you. This is a Pattern of your unnatural Explications. I pass by a great many others, to be short.

For the same Reason, I will only undertake to overthrow *the two Foundations* of your Mysteries; which being done, nothing remains to build your Faith upon. The one is *the eternal Generation*, and the other *the Incarnation* or the Union of the two Natures. To begin with the eternal Generation; it is no difficult.

difficult thing to demonstrate to you, that it hath no ground in the Scripture. For forasmuch as Christ, as you say, is God only upon the Account of his being *begotten* of God, or being *the Son of God*, we have nothing to do but to consult the same Scripture, to see upon what grounds the Title of *Son of God* bestowed upon Christ is founded therein. And if among those Reasons alledged by it, that of an eternal Generation is not to be found, it will necessarily follow, that such a Generation is the Invention of your Teachers. Let us pass by, if you will, that famous Place, wherein the Angel grounds the Title of Son of God upon the miraculous Conception of our Saviour in the Womb of a Virgin by the Power of the Holy Ghost: *The Holy Ghost*, says he to the Virgin, *shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore that holy thing that shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.* Again, let us omit that remarkable Passage, wherein Christ derives his Title of Son of God from his Unction and Heavenly Commission, *Say ye that I blaspheme whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World, because I said, I am the Son of God?* It seems to me impossible to find two Causes or two Reasons of Christ's being the Son of God, more clear and express than these two; *because* he was conceived by the Holy Ghost in the Womb of a Virgin, and *because* the Father hath sanctified him, and sent him into the World. However I will not insist upon them, to stay the longer upon those, in which the Word *to beget* is expressly set down. I know but three Texts belonging to this Subject: The first is in *Acts* 13. 33. where it is said, that God hath begotten his Son by raising him from the dead; *God*, says the Apostle, *hath fulfilled the Promise unto us, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee.* The second, *Heb.* 5. 5. where it is expressly set down, that God hath begotten his Son, by making him his High-Priest: *Christ*, says the Apostle, *glorified not himself to be made an High-Priest, but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to Day have I begotten thee.* The third is in the same Epistle, *chap.* 1. 5. where the same Apostle tells us, that God hath begotten his Son by exalting him above the Angels: *For unto which of the Angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee?* In all these Texts there is no other Generation mentioned, but what is grounded upon the high Glory, which God hath conferred upon his Messias, by raising him from the dead, and making him Lord and Christ. And this Generation is so far from being eternal, that it is expressly said, it was performed *to day*, *viz.* the Day of his Resurrection and Ascension. Your Teachers have been often challenged to produce one single Text of Scripture, wherein the eternal Generation is expressly contained, and is the true Ground of Christ's being called the Son of God. If there is any, you will do me a Kindness to let me know it. Till this be done, I ought to acknowledg no other Generation, but what the Scripture teaches, in those clear and express Texts which I have cited. Hereupon I will acquaint you with an Observation, for which I am beholden to a learned Man, *viz.* That there is a vast Difference between the manner of the Father's speaking of Christ's Divinity, and that of the Apostles. The first fetch'd his Original from I know not what Generation, which was made in the Beginning of the World: it is almost the only Generation spoken of by them, and their Platonick Stile always runs that way. On the contrary, the last shew the Source of it in his miraculous Birth, especially in his Resurrection and Exaltation. Hence it is that though Christ never called himself God, whilst he had but a Glimpse of his future Glory; yet the Apostles made no Scruple to honour him with that glorious Title, when they saw him crowned with his highest Glory & Honour. Now that Difference in treating of the same Doctrine, which is to be seen between the sacred Writers and your Teachers, is a material one, and ought to convince you, that they had not both the

the same Principles, as your Church pretends. This general Observation concerning the Fathers, is sufficient to make me refuse their Testimony, and look upon them as no good Interpreters of the Scripture, and unfaithful Guardians of Tradition.

I come now to *the Incarnation* or the Union of two Natures. You must confess, dear Cousin, that if we can from any Place learn the Distinction of two Natures in Christ, it is undoubtedly from *Rom.* 1. 3. where he is called *the Son of* David *according to the Flesh*, and *the Son of God according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the Resurrection from the Dead.* Here is the Son of *David* and the Son of God, the Flesh and the Spirit, or the Word. Yet this Text is so far from proving two Natures in Christ, such as you understand, that it is the strongest Argument that can be brought against you, to confute that foolish and absurd Distinction, and the clearest Commentary we have, to explain the other Passages, which speak of Christ as a Man and a God. To be convinced of the Truth of this Assertion, you need only compare together the 23*d*, 28*th* and 29*th* Verses of the 4*th* to the *Galatians*: The Apostle says, that *Ismael was born according to the Flesh*, or that he was the Son of *Abraham* according to the Flesh, that is, according to the ordinary Course of Nature; but that *Isaac was born according to the Spirit*, or by a miraculous Birth, that is, he was not so much the Son of *Abraham*, as the Son and Heir of the Divine Promise. This is granted by all. Now according to St. *Paul*'s Stile, it is plain that Christ is *the Son of* David *according to the Flesh*, that is, according to his natural Birth, because he was born of a Woman, and *Son of God according to the Spirit*, viz. according to his supernatural Birth, because he was born of a Virgin by the Operation of the Holy Spirit, and because he was raised from the dead, according to the Spirit of Holiness, as the Apostle speaks: In which Sense he is not so much the Son and Heir of *David*, as the Son and Heir of God, or the Son of that great Promise, which God had made to the Patriarchs. *According to the Spirit*, can therefore signify only *by the Divine Power*, by his miraculous Birth and Resurrection: Which plainly shews that the Distinction of two Natures, in the Sense you take them, is a mere Fancy; because the eternal Generation is not at all mentioned by the Apostle in his Opposition between the Son of *David* and the Son of God, the Flesh and the Spirit, the Humanity and the Divinity of Christ; and because, speaking of those two Natures, taken in a right Sense, he says, that Christ did partake of this last, when he was constituted the Son of God, not by an eternal Generation, but a Divine Sanctification, and the Virtue of his Resurrection.

From what hath been said, it doth plainly appear, dear Cousin, that those are truly *Heretickes*, who forsake the Simplicity and Purity of the Scripture, to coin Mysteries unknown to that Divine Revelation: Unknown, I say, as it is evident from the new Words that have been coined to express them: Which so plainly argues their Novelty, that any one that is but sincere, must needs be no less prejudiced against the strange Words of *Consubstantiality* and *Incarnation*, than against the monstrous Term of *Transubstantiation*. They have both the same Original, Growth and Scope, and consequently, with respect to us, they must have the same Destiny, and be look'd upon by all good Christians, as the Effects of humane Passions, and the dismal Causes of our Divisions. In this you do condemn your selves. For if you pretend to teach the same Doctrines, which are taught in the Scripture, why do not you use the same Words? Your new Terms do betray your Cause, and plainly shew, that according to the Character of an Heretick set down by St. *Paul*, you do act not only against your own Conscience, but against the Design of the Holy Ghost: Seeing you can never speak differently from him, but you must perceive at the same time, that you think differently, and by changing his Words, alter his Notions too.

It is an easy thing to change a Doctrine by the Help of a new Word, especially when to this new Word another is added, and the Explication thereof extended as far as possible, as Councils commonly do, who under Pretence of clearing Truth to its highest degree of Evidence, do so far depart from its Simplicity, that they quite lose the sight of it: so that it may be said, that after so many new Pieces have been borrowed and sewed to that first Garment, it hath lost its Form and Colour, and is no more the same Cloth. But lest you should say, that it is still the same Doctrine, expressed several ways, I shall prove the contrary in few Words. Observe therefore, (dear Cousin) that when the Scripture or the Creed of the Apostles, (which is for the most part made up of scriptural Terms) sets down any Capital Doctrine, it makes use of so plain and intelligible Terms either proper or metaphorical, that they may be understood by all Men. None can be deceived by them, if he is sincere: For Example, when the Apostles Creed says, that there is *an Almighty God, Maker of Heaven and Earth*; that that most high God hath *a Son, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, was born, died, was raised from the Dead*, &c. any one presently apprehends with the whole Catholick Church, what is an Almighty God, Creator of all things; and what is a Son of God, who is his only Son, because none but he hath a Virgin for his Mother, and God for his Father; what it is to be born, to die, and to be raised from the dead, and such other Terms, whereby the Doctrines of our Religion are expressed. There is no Dispute about them, because all Christians have the same Notions of them: so that the Heretick who rejected the Doctrines contained in them, were forced to reject those Scriptures, wherein they were mentioned. But pray how dare you pretend that the Terms which you have contrived, were contrived to signify the same things, seeing they are not commonly used by Men, being all taken out of Philosophy? Besides, their Signification is liable to so many Changes and Alterations, that sometimes they signify one thing, and sometimes another. This is so true, that the very Men of that Age in which they were coined, could not agree about their natural Meaning, one Doctor taking the Word *Hypostasis* for that we call a *Person*, and another for that which we call a *Substance*; one Council rejecting the Word *Consubstantial* as favouring Heresy, and the other looking upon it as a Word fit to confute it. What may be the Reason, that when the Holy Ghost speaks, his Words are so popular and so clear, that reasonable Men cannot mistake the meaning of them? How comes it to pass, that there is no Dispute among Men concerning these Words, *Son of God, who was conceived of the Holy Ghost, was born, died*, &c? But when Men speak, and introduce a Son *consubstantial with the Father, begotten, not made*, &c. some do not understand them at all, let them be never so reasonable; some, though very reachable, cannot endure such a Language; and some disagree about their meaning, though every one of them considers it with a good Intention, and in the Fear of God. You need but consult your *Divines* hereupon; some by *three Persons* understand *three Relations*; some, *three Capacities*; some, *three Minds*; some, *three Somewhats*; and some, *three individual Natures*, as *Peter, James*, and *John*. The Reason of that Difference is obvious and plain: The Holy Ghost sets before us the Divine Revelation full of Wisdom, and accommodated to our Knowledge, and he fixes popular Notions to his Terms: But Men join to their Words remote, abstruse and metaphysical Ideas, and they put such an unnatural Sense upon the Word of God, that even when they use it, it is only to defend their foolish and extravagant Fancies.

Do not tell me that it was wisely done by the Church, to coin those new Words, that the Sense of the Scripture might be fixed thereby, and the Liberty of Hereticks stop'd. So pitiful an Excuse doth not justify your Rashness, it only justifies the Innocence of the

the pretended Heretick. *For what could hinder those Heretics, whom you accuse of wresting the Scripture, to use the same Subtilty, in order to the finding of those new Terms, which you will have them to subscribe to?* They could easily do it, by putting upon them such a Sense as would not be prejudicial to their Opinions. However this very thing, *viz.* their refusing to submit to those new Impositions, is an unanswerable Argument of their Sincerity: and if they cannot be brought, though in order to the saving of their Lives and Estates, to put an unnatural Sense upon Mens Words, which they despise; much less will they wrest the Sense of God's Word, to which they pay the greatest Reverence. From whence it follows, dear Cousin, that you your self are a Heretick: I am sorry to tell you so, but you force me to it. I have yet something more to say to you, give me leave to speak it out; for I do impart my Thoughts to you not in Anger, but with a Desire of making you more attentive to those things, in which your Salvation is so much concerned. I mean that you run the Danger of being one of those *Antichrists* spoken of by St. *John*, when he says, that *whosoever doth not confess that Christ, who came in the Flesh*, (for that is must be rendred) *the same is Antichrist*. For first, since Christ signifies *Anointed*, an Antichrist is one that is an Enemy to the Lord Christ's Anointing. Now do not you destroy that Divine Unction, pretending that Christ is the Son of God by an eternal Generation, which makes him incapable of Unction or Exaltation, and overthrows that Fundamental Truth, *viz.* that *God made him Lord and Christ?* Secondly, since *to come in the Flesh*, signifies to come not like a conquering Prince, but like a Man of Sorrows, do not you destroy *his Flesh* and Sufferings, pretending on one hand, that he is *the most high God*, who can neither be born, nor die; and on the other affirming, that Christ hath not the proper *Personality* of a Man, but *the borrowed* Personality of the eternal Word? so that according to your Notions, the Holy Virgin did not bring forth a Man, but *an human Nature*; the Jews have not crucified a Man, but *an Humanity*. An human Nature is but an *Entitie*, and a mere Fancy: an humanity can neither be born, nor die, nor be raised; which overthrows the full Articles of the Christian Faith, and may convince you of mere *Antichristianism*. For my part, dear Cousin, I can boast, Thanks be to God, of a contrary Character, *viz.* that *he that confesseth that Jesus, who came in the Flesh, is Christ, is born of God.* For I do not believe him to be the most high God, who can neither be born, nor die; but I believe he is *a Man like unto us in all things, Sin excepted, who died for our Sins, and was raised for our Justification.* I confess at the same time, that *Jesus is Christ the Lord, to the Glory of God the Father, who hath highly exalted him, and given him Power, Might, Honour and Glory.* I am amazed to see that instead of building your Faith upon the Rock of that solid Confession, you will by all means found it upon such Doctrines as have no Influence upon Practice. What Advantage is it to your Religion to reckon *three Almighty and three Incomprehensible Ones*, as Objects of Confidence and Worship? Is Infinity capable of more or less? Is one the richer for having ten thousand, than one only infinite? But to believe the only all good, wise, just and Almighty God was pleased to manifest himself to us by his *Messiah*, who is the Prophet that declares his Will to us, the King who engages himself to fulfil his Promises, and the faithful and merciful High-Priest, who can be touched with the feeling of our Infirmities: This, I say, is the Notion of a most wise Religion, which contains a great many Doctrines, wherewith the Mind is enlightned, and the Heart moved, a firm Support to our Faith, a solid Foundation to our Hopes, and a thousand Encouragements to Holiness of Life. I exhort you, dear Cousin, to a serious Consideration of so simple, but so rich a Religion. Do it with an honest and sincere Heart, and I hope by God's Grace, that so great a Light will scatter the Mist that surrounds you, and help you to overcome the

Prejudices of a Party. For it is to be presumed that they are on your side; and one that owes his Religion to his Birth and Education, ought always to mistrust them. You are already gone a great way, adopting *St. Augustin*'s Maxim, *viz. That whatever Expression of the Scripture seems to command a Crime, must needs be figurative.* Go on and be sure, that any Expression of the Scripture, which seems to require the Belief of an Absurdity and a Contradiction, must needs be figurative. The Reason is the same, for if the Scripture cannot require of you any thing that is contrary to the natural Notions you have of Piety; for Example, to eat humane Flesh; it can neither impose upon your Belief any thing that is contrary to your natural Ideas of Truth; as for Example, That a Man who dies is the living and immortal God. I leave it to your Consideration, recommending you to God, and the Word of his Grace. I am,

Dear Cousin,

Yours, *&c.*

POSTSCRIPT.

Dear Cousin;

After a second Reading of your Letter, I have observed some Fragments of the Writings of your Teachers, which you took the Pains to transcribe, and upon which you seem to rely much as upon good Authorities. I shall tell you, that several of your Teachers have over-strained the Matter, and that a modest Man ought not to depend upon their Expressions. Some others have been so inconstant in their Judgment concerning Hereticks, that they have blown hot and cold with the same Mouth, according to the several Circumstances they have been in. However we need only, in opposition to them, to consider the Testimony of some more wise and moderate Divines, whose Names are no less eminent and respected in the Church of God. These are so far from damning devout Christians that are in Error, that they will not damn devout and virtuous Jews and Heathens. Do but read *the Christian Life, Vol. 3. p. 2.* wherein Dr. *Scot* tells you, that *to live according to mere natural Reason, is all that God expects from those to whom Christianity hath never been proposed:* and as for those to whom it hath been sufficiently proposed, he lays upon them no other Obligations, but those wherewith Christ hath strengthned natural Religion. 'Since Christianity, says he, hath improved the Duties 'of natural Religion upon new Principles, 'and inforced them with new Obligations; 'to render our Piety and Vertue strictly and 'properly Christian, it is necessary that we 'should receive those new Principles, and 'act according to those new Obligations. But lest you should dispute about those Principles and Obligations, which the Gospel adds to natural Religion; I shall abridg this Dispute by a fine Place taken out of *the Design of Christianity*: The pious Author of that excellent Book says, (*p.* 236.) that if one would be sure that one keeps the Foundation of Christianity, and is in no damnable Error, he must examine himself thus: 'Am I sincere-'ly willing to obey my Creator and Redeem-'er in all things commanded by them? Do 'I entertain and harbour no Lust in my 'Breast? Do I heartily indeavour to have a 'right Understanding of the Holy Scriptures, 'and chiefly of the Gospel, and to know 'what Doctrines are delivered there, in or-'der to the bettering of my Soul by them, 'and the Direction of my Life and Actions 'according to them? If we can answer those

'Questions

'Questions in the Affirmative, (*who can* 'doubt but all pious Hereticks may do it) what-'soever Mistakes we may labour under, they 'can be none of them such as will undo our 'Souls, because we shall have Cause to con-'clude from thence, that the Design of Chri-'stianity is in some measure effected in us: 'And whatsoever Tenets may be accompa-'nied and consist with the true Love of God, 'and a sollicitous Care to keep a Conscience 'void of Offence towards him and Men, we 'may be certain that they belong not to the 'Catalogue of fundamental Errors. This 'obedient Temper is the most infallible Mark 'of an *Orthodox* Man; he that is endowed 'with it, though he may err, cannot be an '*Heretick*. If I was as bold as you, dear Cousin, I would apply to you a fine Passage of our worthy *Arch-Bishop of Canterbury*, in his Sermon upon *Luke* 10. 42. wherein he blames the Rashness of those, who like you dare censure Error and Heresy in others, whilst they themselves do not think *of curing those Lusts, Vices and Passions, which so visibly reign in them.* But I shall only cite that general Reflection of his concerning those pretended Orthodox. *Deluded People*, says he, *that do not consider that the greatest Heresy in the World is a wicked Life; because it is so directly and so fundamentally opposite to the whole Design of the Christian Faith and Religion, and that God will sooner forgive a Man an hundred Defects of his Understanding, than one Fault of his Will.*

And to shew you in one Word, that when you attribute *Immodesty, Wantonness and Pride* to Hereticks, you act against the Spirit of your Church; the Testimony of one of your Teachers only will suffice, since he speaks for the whole Clergy: I mean the Author of *the Vindication of the conformed Clergy from the unjust Aspersions of Heresy*: (That Heresy was no less than *Pelagianism* and *Socinianism*.) See how he vindicates your Teachers. 'The Reason, says he, why they are accused 'of Heresy, is their Moderation in Points of 'Controversy. They do not confute their 'Opponent with a rude and insignificant 'Noise, nor think they shall ever convince 'him by hard Words and ill Names, which 'are the only Arguments that some Men are 'able to manage; but they consider and are 'willing to make Allowances for the com-'mon Infirmities of humane Understandings, 'and the strong Prejudices of Education: 'and therefore they treat all Men gently, and 'are not rudely clamorous in their Dis-'courses, but hope the best, and think as 'charitably as they can of those that are of 'a different Persuasion. See the Moderation of your Church, imitate so charitable and Christian a Judgment, and cease to damn, like Jews and Heathens, proud and conceited Men, those good Men, who work out their Salvation with Fear and Trembling, lest with what Judgment ye judg, ye may be judged. The same Author will tell you, that the Term of *Heretick* is a Name that is given now-a-days liberally, and at a good rate, and that, 'It is nothing but the Passion 'of the Opponents, that hath made that 'Name so very common as it is; for it is 'grown no more now than an ordinary Term 'of Reproach, for every angry Man, that 'would fain be dealing with controversial 'Divinity, that it serves for one of the prin-'cipal Topicks for the great Professors of ar-'tificial Scolding, &c. Read but p. 70. As to that *great Conceit and Confidence of their own Knowledg*, of which you think Hereticks are so full, that *they resolve never to allow that to be the Sense of the Revelation, however plain and evident the Words are, which is not agreeable to their Reason, but will put another Sense upon them, though never so forced and violent*: As to this, I will tell you; First, that they have borrowed that Method from the very Principle of the Reformation. When, dear Cousin, those Words of Christ are objected to you, *This is my Body*; *My Flesh is Meat indeed: My Blood is Drink indeed: Whoso eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood*, &c. When, I say, those Places of the Scripture are objected to you, who follow the Spirit of the Reformation, *Are you not resolved never to allow that to be the Sense of the Revelation, however plain and evident these Words are, which is not agreeable to*

your Sense and Reason; and will you not put another Sense upon them, though never so forced and violent, as in effect you do, when you say that *by the Body* of Christ is meant *the Figure of his Body; by eating his Flesh, to believe in him*, &c? But I have already touched that Article in my Letter, and therefore I shall insist no longer upon it. Secondly, Who puts upon the Scripture a more unnatural Sense than you do in this Controversy? Who hath a greater Pride of Understanding, and is more conceited of his Reasonings? Hereticks so called, make Religion to consist in the Profession of a simple Faith, which they express in the very Terms of Scripture, holding fast the Form of sound Words, so afraid they are to indulge their Reason too much, and to wrest the Language and Intention of the Holy Ghost. But you on the contrary, who rely altogether upon humane Expressions, taken out of the Pagan Philosophy, metaphysical Arguments and Abstractions, or remote Consequences; you, I say, must needs violate the sacred Reverence due to God's Word, put a forced Sense upon the Words of the Holy Ghost, and shew at the same time a proud Confidence, by making the Scripture speak any thing that agrees with your Notions. There is not *one* Word or Proposition in that Scripture, but will signify quite *contrary things*, according to your Distinctions and Consequences. You distinguish between the Son of Man, and the Son of God, yet you confound those two Terms, when you think fit, and make the Son of Man to be the Son of God, and the Son of God to be the Son of Man: If we say that it was the Son of Man that came down from Heaven: you reply, that the Son of Man signifies there the Son of God. If we object that the Son of God knew not the Day of Judgment; you answer, that by the Son of God in that Place is meant the Son of Man: If one asks you, What's the Name of the first Person of the Trinity? you answer, *the Father*, and insist earnestly upon that Distinction of Persons, to avoid the Force of this Objection, *viz.* That if Christ were the most high God, he would be the Father of himself. But if we object, that the Father only knows the Day of Judgment, and that he only is the true God and Creator of all things; then the Word *Father* signifies no more what it signified before, I mean the first Person of the Trinity, but the whole Trinity, and the very Son whom he hath begotten: so great is your Skill in doing and undoing the Work of the Holy Ghost, by contradicting Hereticks in Season and out of Season. Let this suffice as to what concerns Words. The same may be said of the Propositions of the Scripture, either affirmative or negative. By the enchanting Virtue of your Distinctions, the Affirmative becomes Negative, and the Negative Affirmative, when there is any need of it, and two contradictory Propositions are equally true and divine, if at any time it can serve your turn. It may be said, that Christ hath wrought Miracles, and hath wrought no Miracles; that he knew not the Day of Judgment, and knew it; that he was born, and not born. In a word, one may overthrow the whole Gospel and Creed, all those Contradictions are Orthodox, if one doth but keep in his Mind the blessed Distinction of two Natures, which directs the Intention, and hinders a Man from telling a Lie.

By such Tricks as these you pretend to Orthodoxy, and boast of a Principle that promotes Holiness and Piety; and, as you say, hath a great Influence upon all the Parts of Religion. But, dear Cousin, don't you know that the learned Dr. *Hammond*, who made a large practical Catechism, could find no Place in his Book for the great Spring of the Trinity? No question but he look'd upon it as a thing altogether useless and uncapable of moving the Heart of Man. Make no doubt of it, it is a dry and empty Opinion, a Bone without Marrow or Meat, which can afford a Christian Soul no sort of good Nourishment in order to Piety. I confess there is a Trinity that hath Influence upon the Life of all true Christians, *viz.* that in which you and I have been baptized, the Father, the

the Son, and the Holy Ghost. But I must confess at the same time, that it is very different from yours, if understood according to Scripture. We have the Doctrine of the Father revealed by his Son, his Interpreter and Messias, and confirmed by the Gifts and Miracles of the Holy Spirit. This Doctrine hath so necessary an Influence upon the Practice of Christians, that without a right Knowledg of that Revelation we could neither obey God's Commands, nor hope for his Rewards. And I confess, that with respect to this primitive and capital Truth, any Man to whom that great Object is proposed, shall be no less accountable for the Faults of his Understanding than the Vices of his Will. There is a plain Reason for it, *viz.* that this Object doth not consist in Philosophical Speculations, which the Simple cannot attain to, and the Ignorance whereof must needs be excusable; but in plain and sensible Facts, for the believing of which, nothing else is required but the same Honesty and Sincerity necessary to practise the Precepts. For Example, We believe a Father, Creator of all things; a Son born, dead, raised, *&c.* and a Holy Ghost setting the Seal of his Miracles to that Revelation. Here is a Faith grounded upon undeniable Facts, which doth not require from us a seraphick Understanding, but some Honesty to receive the Testimony of those who relate them with as much Evidence as is necessary to satisfy an honest and reasonable Mind. The Want of Faith or Understanding in this Respect, is the Want of Probity and Uprightness; and therefore the Fault is inexcusable. But if instead of so simple and sensible a Faith, you introduce your *Athanasian* Faith of three Eternal, Almighty, and Incomprehensible Ones, you make Unbelief of all things the most pardonable, nay, and the most reasonable too, because such a Faith is above the Reach of our Senses, Reason, and Revelation. So that we must read in the Gospel, *I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, because thou hast hid these things from Babes, and hast revealed them unto the Wise and Prudent.* I can assure you that not only many eminent Bishops and great Councils have rejected the Belief of such a Mystery, as you confess it, but that no good Christian knew it, except perhaps in his Catechism, or a Book of Controversy. How many Monuments of Antiquity have we lost, of which we could boast with great Reason? Who can tell but most Fathers had been on our side, if the Malice of their Enemies, the Superstition of Monks, and the Flames of the Emperors had not destroyed their Books? As for those that remain, nothing but this can be concluded from them, *viz.* that the Party that prevailed (History tells us by what means) took Possession of Tradition and Orthodoxy. However we have still in the Apostles Creed the Primitive Truths, which unite all Christians, the saving Truths wherewith God's Providence fed the Faith of Christians during the Quarrels of their Teachers, and the only Truths, for whose sake true Martyrs have shed their Blood. I shall add, that the same Providence hath preserved in all Sects and Ages a Body of Christian Morality, which makes the great and whole Design of the Gospel. Let us conclude here, and seriously think, dear Cousin, that you and I shall be judged by Christ in the last Day only according to this Rule, independently on those Opinions, which now a-days make the Subject of our Disputes. I rest,

Yours, *&c.*

FINIS.

An ACCURATE

EXAMINATION

OF THE

Principal Texts

Usually alledged for

The Divinity of our Saviour;

AND

For the Satisfaction by him made to the Justice of God, for the Sins of Men:

Occasioned by a BOOK of Mr. *L. Milbourn*,

CALLED,

Mysteries (in Religion) vindicated.

[By Stephen Nye]

London, Printed in the Year, 1692.

AN ABRIDGMENT

EXAMINATION

OF THE

Principal Texts

Usually alleged for

The Divinity of our Saviour,

IN

For the Satisfaction by him made to the Justice of God, for the Sins of Man:

Collected by a BOOK of Mr. [illegible]

CALLED,

Mysteries (in Religion) examined.

[illegible]

London, Printed in the Year, 1692.

THE PREFACE TO Mr. L. MILBOURN.

SIR,

I *Began to read your Book, with very* close *attention and regard; but when I had gone over some part of it, I perceived you were not so qualified, that you might (reasonably) undertake to intermeddle in these Questions, or deserve to be heard concerning them. If, in defect of other necessary Endowments of a Writer, you please your self however in the* bulkiness *of your Book; you may be advised for the time to come, that on the contrary, every* Trifle *is so much the better, by how much the shorter it is; and that a* verbose *Trifler is nauseous even to Friends.*

In your Dedication you say, the Bishops ought to use a just Severity against, *and to* frown effectually *upon such, whom the late Act of Toleration excludes from all Benefit thereby: that is, they ought to fall to persecuting the Socinians, for the (supposed) Errors of their Conscience. Truly* (Sir) *we are beholden to you. But what if the Socinians, against whom you* publickly *excite the Bishops, should write the* Farce *of your Life? They know very well the several* Scenes *of it, and the* Part *you have acted at* Pembr. *Hall, at* London, *and afterwards at* Yarmouth, *from whence 'tis said* you ran away: *Are you not aware, that it were easy for them to make you a Town-talk; as you have made your self a Country-talk, and at best withdrew your self? Your* Preface *has two Parts; The First is an Apology for your Book; the other is taken up in complementing* T. F.

I will speak briefly to both.

I. *That you have said* but a little in a great deal, *that the Parts of your Book are* ill put together, *that you have been* impertinent *in diverting to Matters, that were beside your Text and Undertaking; all these you confess: but you excuse the Meanness*

of your Performance by your Poverty, and your Poverty you lay to the Charge of the People of Yarmouth; *who could not, you say, be made sensible of your Learning and Worth; that is* the meaning *of what you have said at* Pag. 1. *of your* Preface.

But such as know Yarmouth, *how populous and wealthy it is, will not be perswaded out of it, but that a Person of no more Learning or Parts than* L. M. *were he withal but* Modest, Peaceable, *and* Exemplary, *might live at* Yarmouth *in quality of their Minister, very handsomly and comfortably, and besides be esteem'd and belov'd. They tell us, that seeing your Sermons against us, have been so little liked at their Majesty's* good Town *of* Yarmouth; *we ought to make trial, how that* discerning *People will entertain our Pamphlets; they have already* refused the Evil, *there is therefore reasonable hope, that they will* chuse *the* Good, *and will rejoice in it.*

The second Part of your Preface *is all Complement on* T. F. *Thus you begin, calling him,* pert Smatterer in Ignorance: *so says the* Reverend *Mr.* L. M. *and this was the* best *he could say, when he undertook to give a Character of* T. F.

But I find that the most Reverend *are in a very different Story concerning this Gentleman: The Metropolitan of all* England, *thought fit to say of him,* That Worthy and Useful Citizen, Mr. *T. F.* Fun. Sermon on Mr. *Gouge,* p. 63. *What may be the Reason that* T. F. *is drawn in such different Colours? I think 'tis not hard to find the Reason: Some, because they heartily love God, and reverence Vertue and Well-doing, can think and speak respectfully, even of those from whom they differ very widely in their Sentiments about the* controverted *Points of Christianity: for God's sake they can cordially smile upon a good Man, though they think him in an Error; and they are of Opinion, because the Holy Scriptures have said it, that fervent* Charity *is greater than* Faith. *But others, measuring all Persons and Things, by only the narrow Interests of* themselves *and their* Party, *and wholly excluding God, and the relation to him, rail against their Adversaries, giving all Men to the Devil that are of a Belief contrary to theirs. Which brings to mind what Mr.* Calvin *has observed:* '*Ut quisq; eorum pro ventre est maximè sollicitus, ita pro fide suâ deprehenditur Bellator acerrimus*: i. e. 'As any of them are more concerned, and afraid for their Bellies; so he is found to bawl and 'rail loudest, on behalf of his own 'particular Faith and Party. *Calv. Præf. ad Institut.* p. 7.

Well, but what might be the very meaning of this Witticism on T. F. pert Smatterer in Ignorance? *I suppose the meaning is,* T. F. *has had his Education at* London, *not at* Cambridg *or* Oxford; *he knows nothing*

of

of Predicables, Predicaments *and* Syllogisms; *nor has ever learned* there *to drink the third or fourth Bottle for his own share.* *What an unhappy Education was this, that his Friends took no care to make him a* Fool *and a* Debauch; *that the Gifts and Impressions of God and Nature, have not been effaced by a sort of Institution, which sometimes to make a* Scholar, *defaces both the* Man *and the* Christian? T. F. *has only* Reason *and* good Sense; *how unlucky was it, that he should not destroy them by Logick and Metaphysicks? However, I am of Opinion,* T. F. *will make his natural Talents go as far, and do him as much Service and Credit, as Logick and Metaphysicks, and skill of the Bottle, will do for* L. M. *or for his Cause.*

The next Charge upon him, is in these words; The Socinians Hawker, to disperse their new-fangled Divinity. *Hawker! of all Men living,* L. M. *should have forbore this word Hawker; unless he has forgot, because 'tis a good while since, how unluckily the hawking off Books succeeded with himself, in a certain place which at present I forbear to name. See, Sir, we can be affronted and abused, without making haste to revenge our selves.*

But why is our Divinity new-fangled? *It hath two such Marks of* Antiquity, *by confession of our very Opposers, that could they show either of them for their Divinity, we would make little difficulty of coming over to their Party. For, first, 'tis acknowledged by the most Learned of our Opposers, that the* Patriarchal Ages, *and the Church of the Old Testament, never knew the Doctrine of the Trinity: We are confess'd (by our Adversaries) to believe concerning God, as the Patriarchs and Prophets believed; namely, that there is* but one who is God, *or that* God is but one Person. *Secondly, The Apostles Creed, the only Monument of true Antiquity, besides the Bible, which the Christian Church has, is owned (too) to be wholly Unitarian; for it gives the Appellation* God, *to only the Almighty Father, Maker of Heaven and Earth: and speaks of our Saviour under no other Characters, but those of a* Man, *describing his Conception or Generation (by the Holy Ghost,* or Power of God) *in the Womb of Holy* Mary, *declaring that he* died, *was* buried, rose again, *and* was exalted *to the right Hand of God,* that is, *to be next unto God; all which is* a denying him to be God. *It says no more of the* Holy *Ghost, than it says of the* Holy *Catholick Church: I believe* in *the Holy Ghost, I believe* in *the Holy Catholick Church; so (all know) this Creed is read in the Original Greek.*

Your last fling at T. F. *is to this purpose, tho after a scurrilous fashion; that* the Socinians *have made choice of him, to disperse their Pamphlets;* That a Person so much concerned and imployed in the disposal of Charity, might keep the Ballance even, between Heaven and Hell; and while he supports Mens Bodies,

dies, might pervert and poison their Souls.

'Tis well, Sir; but what will your Wisdomship *advise in the case? Shall we turn this* dangerous *Man out of the gainful Imployment of neglecting his own Business, and losing his Time, to be an Instrument of Good to the* Poor *and* Necessitous? *And let me ask you this Question, Do you really think, that this Gentleman ever endeavoured to proselyte to his particular Perswasion any of* the Objects of Charity, *with whom he is concerned? Does he, think you, seek to* gather a Church *out of the Hospitals, the Prisons, the Corners of Streets, or of such Persons as are ready to perish for want of Bread or Clothes? If you your self do not so think, as you are challenged, to give but one single Instance of what you would insinuate: to your Head* you are an ill Man, *to make that the subject of your Scurrility, which should have been of your Praises and Commendations. Doth the Age, Sir, so abound with Men, who make it any part of their business to* minister to the Wants of others, *that it should be advisable to discourage such Persons, by false and scandalous Innuendo's? But I am with-held by a particular Charge, as I am told, from him, from doing him that Right against your Reproaches, which I thought to be due to his Exemplary Industry, and particular Dexterity in solliciting and managing the Cause and Interests of the Poor: He saith, if what he doth in that matter will not defend it self, he is content to be without a Defence.*

You conclude with submitting ALL that you have written to the Censure and Correction of Holy Mother-Church.

I acknowledg the Language of Babylon; *but was it convenient, that a* Presbyter of the Church of *England (as you write your self) should thus publish to the whole World, that he has neither* Faith *nor* Religion; *I mean of his own, but only what Mother-*Church *shall prescribe to him, as the terms of Preferment? He propounds here in a Book of* 800 *Pages, the Doctrines of the Trinity and the Satisfaction, as* Essential *Articles of the Christian Religion; and such as must be believed, or (if you'll believe him) you shall* without doubt perish everlastingly: *He pretends he has proved these Doctrines by* Demonstrations *of Reason, and by* Testimonies *of Holy Scripture, and of all Antiquity: Well, does he himself believe what he has written? Not a Tittle of it, he says, unless Mother-*Church *approves of it; he submits ALL, Faith and Proofs, to* the Censure *and Correction of his Holy Mother; let her hang or save, he submits.*

This is the Man with whom we have to deal, without Faith and without Conscience, unless as the Church directs; nay, and he dares profess too, to be otherwise without either. Neither is L. M. *alone, but there are many others that believe their Paradoxes*

no more than we do, but they subdue first their Consciences, and afterwards their Minds to the Sophistries usually alledged to prove them, so long as Holy Mother Church (which can dispose of their Fortunes in the World) recommends this Belief as the condition of holding a Parsonage or Vicarage, or of getting a Deanary or Prebend. On the same Conditions Mother Shipton *should be as sacred and infallible with them as Mother* Church; *and they would believe the Kingdom of* Oberon, *and the Territories of* Fairy-Land: *and had they been born Papists, Transubstantiation should have been reckoned among the holy* Mysteries, *which* Faith *must imbrace, tho* Reason *(craz'd they say, since the Fall of* Adam*) disclaims and renounces them.*

But who is Holy Mother-Church *to whom they pay such Profound Submissions? I meet with her in Story some hundreds of Years past; she seems to be such a one as the Scots imagin'd Queen* Elizabeth *to be: I mean, as* uncertain *and* vivacious. *The Scots thought their King should never succeed to the Crown of* England; *for Queen* Elizabeth, *say they, is not a particular Woman: But the Lords of the Council in* England *call an old Woman Queen* Elizabeth; *and so long as there is an old Woman in* England, *they will never want a Queen* Elizabeth.

But the worst thing, to my Fancy, in Holy Mother-Church, is this, that she is such an Individuum Vagum; *in one place she is this thing, in another she is the just contrary: she is not the same in* England *(for instance) that she is at* Rome, *or at* Geneva, *or in* Germany, *and the two Northern Kingdoms, or in the Provinces of the* Levant; *in all these places she is so different a Person, that she* mortally *hates and* furiously *persecutes her own self.*

I find just such another Fantasm haunting the chosen *Nation, as is now meant by Mother-*Church; *and it was in as much regard with two sorts of People, the Designing and the Weak, as Mother-*Church *is now with the like sorts of Men and Women.* Jer. 7. 4. Trust not in vain words, saying, The Temple of the Lord, The Temple of the Lord, The Temple of the Lord are these. *By which they intended what some now do, when they say* Mother-Church, Mother-Church, Mother-Church; *but the Prophet ventures to call them* vain words, i. e. *a lying and unprofitable Pretence.*

But after all that Reverence which any pretend to have for this Holy Mother: *'tis certain there is nothing really meant by* our Holy Mother the Church, *but only* the strongest side, *or the prevailing Party. And all the mighty Complements Men use to this blessed Mother, are nothing else but their* Wit *or their* Fears. *They find themselves the Slaves of an usurping Faction in the Church, which is able to constrain them to profess any thing, tho never*

so

so contradictory and absurd: therefore the Witty *presently list themselves of the Party, call themselves her* Sons *and Children, and* subscribe *and* swear *to all she propounds. In others, their Dread and Awe turns into real Reverence, or rather Superstition; and they act and believe as they are commanded, without desiring or caring to reflect upon the Causes which first* biassed *their Minds to this Obedience; but those Causes were originally nothing else, but the Power and Wealth of the Holy Mother, that is (as was said)* of the strongest side.

But there is another sort of People, called Schismaticks and Hereticks, who having free and discerning Minds, stout and brave Souls, finding themselves (in some Particulars) either cheated *or* wronged *by the strongest side; they maintain, tho a dangerous and hazardous, yet a generous and perpetual War, for the Natural Liberties of Mankind in Matters of Conscience and Religion. They assert by all possible (and honest) means,* the King-dom of God; *that is, they admit of no Lords over Conscience, but only God; nor any Law of Faith, of Worship or Manners, but only God's Word; no Canons or Articles, no humanly devised Creeds or Catechisms, nothing but God's Word,* the naked Gospel, *without any Interpretations or Interpreters, but only* Reason *and* Good Sense. *These have the luck sometimes to baffle* Mother-Church, *and to bear up against all her Indignation.*

But this, Sir, shall serve in Answer to your Dedication and Preface; only let me advise you, as you would come off with more Credit, and do more Good in the Parish of Great St. Hellens, *than you did at Great* Yarmouth, *that you carry it with more Modesty and Respect to all the Inhabitants, and to forbear such smutty Lampoons as you made upon that Town. What follows is an Answer to your Book, and I address it to Friend* T. F.

An

An Accurate EXAMINATION of the principal Texts, usually alledged for the *Divinity* of our *Saviour*; and for the *Satisfaction* by him made to the Justice of God, for the Sins of Men: Occasioned by a Book of Mr. *Luke Milbourn*, called, *Mysteries* (*in Religion*) *Vindicated*. To *T. F.*

[By Stephen Nye]

CHAP. I.

Containing an accurate Examination of 1 Tim. 3. 16.

SIR,

YOUR (particular) Friend Mr. *Milb.* has begun his Attack on Socinianism, with a Text of St. *Paul*; in the Explication and Vindication of which, he wastes no fewer than 82 Pages: The Text is this, *Great is the Mystery of Godliness, God was manifest in the Flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the World, received up into Glory.* 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. He saith hereupon, that indeed some *Translators* read here, *Great is the Mystery of Godliness, WHICH* (which Mystery) *was manifested by Flesh:* that is, the *Law* was given by *Angels*, but the *Gospel* by the Ministry of *Men*, (even by Jesus Christ, and his Apostles) called *Flesh* here, in opposition to Angels who are *Spirit*; and because *Flesh* is the usual Scripture-Term for *Man:* but all the *Greek Copies* (he saith) agree in reading this Text, as we read it in our English Bibles; as also does the famous *Manuscript* in the King of *England's* Library, which is about 1300 Years old.

And if (saith he) the Providence of God, as the Socinians contend, is concerned to preserve his own holy Word from Corruptions and Falsifications; 'tis reasonable to think, such Providence has been exercised rather about the *Original Greek*, than about *Translations*. But neither, saith he, do all the *old* Translations read here, as the Socinians do; for the *Arabick* reads as we do, *GOD was manifested in the Flesh.*

Furthermore, *Macedonius*, to whom the Socinians impute the Corruption of this Text, was too late in time; for he lived in the Year 512. to attempt an Innovation in Scripture: And besides, he could have no design in so doing; because he had no *peculiar* Opinions about our Saviour.

Finally, the word *God* in the first Clause of this Verse, makes that Clause to accord with all that follow it; for all of them

together will make this most proper Sense. "The Eternal Son of God, God equal with "his Father, and Creator of the World, "took upon him, and was *manifested* in our "weak and passible Nature, being incarnate "in the Man Christ Jesus: He was *justified* "to be God, notwithstanding his mean "outward Appearance, by divers glorious "Actions and Miracles, done on that be-"half by the Holy Spirit: He was *seen* (*i. e.* "known) *by Angels*, to be the Eternal "Son of God, and God, thô covered with "the Veil of Flesh: He was *preached* as such, "by the Apostles *to the Gentiles*; was *be-"lieved on* generally in the World, where-"ever they came: and after his Resurrecti-"on He was *received up* into the Glories of "Heaven.

But if, saith our Author, we read here, as the Socinians do; *Great is the Mystery of Godliness, WHICH Mystery was manifested by Flesh*, that is, *by Men*; what Sense shall we make of the other Clauses? Will it be Sense to say, The Mystery of Godliness (the Gospel) was *seen by Angels?* Or will it be true, that it was *received up into the Glory* of Heaven? The Socinians indeed here answer, That instead of these words, *received up into Glory*, it should have been said by our Translators, *was gloriously extolled*, was magnified and lifted up: but this, saith our Author, is false; for on the contrary, the Gospel was despised and derided both by Jews and Gentiles.

This is the Sum and Force of what he has transcribed out of Authors, in behalf of his Opinion, from the words of this Text. He might, if he had pleased, have given us too the full and solid Answer, made by the Socinians, to these Pretences of his Party: for I see, he has quoted the Books, in which those Answers are to be found: but that was not the way, he thought, to mend his Fortunes in the World; which is what he aims at, and the cause of his writing his Book.

I will (briefly) evince these two things.

1. This Text of St. *Paul* has been *falsified* by those, who affirm the Ante-mundan Existence, and Divinity of our Saviour.

2. This Corruption has been so unskilfully performed, that the Attempt serves, only to betray their Unfaithfulness and Partiality, but does not a whit avail their Cause.

1. This Text has been most certainly falsified, by substitution of the word *God*, instead of *Which*, *WHICH* (*Mystery*) *was manifested by Flesh*.

The first time I meet with this Text, read with the word *God*, among the Antients, is in the Acts of the first Council of *Nice*; a Council of next Authority to the Scriptures themselves, in the Opinion of our Oppofers. In this Council, a Person repeated the words of St. *Paul*, as they are now read by Trinitarians; *God was manifested in Flesh*: the Person who made this Mistake, probably from some *Marginal Note*, where he found the word *God* put as an Explanation of the word *Which* in the Text, was answered by *Macarius* Bishop of *Jerusalem*; that he mistook the reading, for St. *Paul*'s words are, *Great is the Mystery of Godliness, WHICH was manifested by Flesh*.

Mr. *Milbourn* will not say, that the Authors of the *Old* Translations, the Latin, Syriac and Armenian, were Unitarians; be sure St. *Jerom* (Author of the Latin) was a bigotted Trinitarian: yet they and he read with the *Nicene* Council, *WHICH was manifested by Flesh*, not *GOD was manifested in Flesh*. I appeal to any Man, of ordinary sense, whether he can think, those Translators and Fathers would have corrupted the Bible in favour, and to the advantage of their Adversaries the Unitarians, by saying (not *GOD*, but) *WHICH* was manifested by Flesh: and whether their so translating (*WHICH was manifested by Flesh*) be not a Demonstrative Proof, that the Greek Copies of those ancient Times did read, as the Socinians now do?

But he saith, the *Arabic* Version of Scripture is on his side. I am not now in a place, where I have many Books; and particularly none of the *Polyglots*; but I see, that

Grotius

Grotius and other Criticks (in Mr. *Pool's* Collection) do all allow, that the *Arabic* reads here, as the Syriac and Latin do, *WHICH was manifested by Flesh.* Therefore I suppose, that our Author makes use of a *Polyglot* that has been conformed (*i. e.* corrupted) by the Publishers, to the present Greek Editions: for not only the Arabic, but the Syriac and Latin have been so used in divers places, by later Publishers; as Father *Simon* often observes. Besides, the question is, concerning the *Old* Translations, made before Trinitarians were become absolute Masters of *Christendom*; such as the Latin, Armenian and Syriac: the Arabic is much later; all the Arabic Versions having been made, but only since the Conquest of the Eastern Provinces by the Turks. F. *Simon* Crit. Hist. on the Old Test. *l.* 2. *c.* 16. *p.* 109, &c.

'Tis by the Trinitarians themselves, that we are informed of divers Editions of the Greek Copies; in which the Publishers have *corruptly*, say they themselves, put *God* for *Which* in this Text. Thus *Grotius* (in *lib.*) cites *Hincmarus*, confessing, that the Nestorian Trinitarians corruptly substituted *God* for *Which* in these words of *St. Paul*; so much the better to defend themselves against the Eutychians. And *Liberatus* assures us, that *Macedonius* (Patriarch of *Constantinople*) was deposed in a Council summoned by the Emperor *Anastasius*, *Anno* 512. for publishing a Greek Edition of the Bible, in which he corrupted this Text, by causing all the Copiers to write *God* in the place of *Which*. Of these two Authors, *Hincmarus* was a Person of great Dignity, being Archbishop of *Rhemes*, and (by Confession of our Opposers) not only altogether Orthodox, but very Learned and Pious: the other, *Liberatus*, was Archdeacon of *Carthage*; and besides the Qualities of Orthodox and Learned, was also contemporary to the matter of which he writes, the Deposition of *Macedonius* for corrupting this Text.

What now does Mr. *Milbourn* oppose to these *Authentick* Histories? He opposes only two silly *Conjectures*. He saith, he doth not think, *Macedonius* would attempt such a thing; because he had no peculiar Opinions of his own about our Saviour; and because he seems too late in Time, to hope reasonably that the Forgery could pass unobserved.

But does not Mr. *Milbourn* know, that *this Macedonius* was a Trinitarian? Do not all the Church-Historians call him *Orthodox*? And was not this cause enough, with an ill Man, as the Council judged him to be, to adventure on such an Undertaking? Nor was this Corruption *so late in Time*, but that it has been the cause, that many Publishers have followed his Copies; and his presence (without doubt) was, that he found the word *God* in the Margins of some Bibles, which he took to be a Correction, not an Explication (as indeed it was) of the word *Which* in the Body of the Text.

But here, Sir, you your self will perhaps object, that these Corruptions being thus noted by Learned Men, and even by Councils, would not have been followed by all the Copiers and Publishers of the Bible: but we see, so Mr. *Milb.* says, that all the Greek Copies, especially the famous one in the King's Library (about 1300 Years old, and therefore *older than Macedonius*) read here, *GOD was manifested in the Flesh.*

To this, I say, I believe all the Greek Copies that Mr. *Milbourn* has seen, may so read; for he has seen ('tis likely) some *one*; but he ought to have consulted Learned Men, before he was so confident, that all (absolutely All) Greek Copies read as 'tis in his Book. *Erasmus*, somewhat learneder than our Author, says, *Multa vetera exemplaria*, *i. e.* a great many of the ancient Copies read, *WHICH was manifested by Flesh*: and saith *Erasmus* further, *I approve of that reading.* Our Author may see these words of *Erasmus* in Mr. *Pool's* Collection of Criticks in *L.* And if Mr. *Milbourn* had look'd into the Margin of *Curcellaus* his most correct Edition of the Greek Testament, he would have seen there, that the ancient Greek Copies used by that Critick, read *WHICH*

was manifested by Flesh: and so also *Morinus*, another famous Critick, acknowledges.

I know not how old the Copy in the King's Library may be, Mr. *Milbourn* is positive, that 'tis about 1300 Years old, and older than *Macedonius:* when his hand was in, he might have said, 'tis now precisely 1592. Years old; and is the very Autographal Copy of St. *John* the Evangelist; he may say so, if he pleases; for the Book has no Date, nor any certain Circumstance, by which we may judg 'tis 1300 Years old, rather than 1000 or 1100, and therefore *younger than Macedonius.*

But our Author says, we cannot make *Sense* and *Truth* of the other Clauses in this Verse; if we read this *governing* Clause by, *WHICH was manifested by Flesh*; for how was this *Mystery* of the Gospel *seen by Angels*, and how was it *received up into Glory?*

He is a forward Man at censuring, but he should have had more Manners, when the Writers of Holy Scripture were concerned. We affirm, that St. *Paul* doth here say, the Mystery of the Gospel was *seen by Angels:* Why should not this be *Truth* and *Sense*; when another Apostle hath expressly told us, that *the Angels desire to look into it?* 1 Pet. 1. 12.

Instead of *received up into Glory*, he knows, that we translate by *was received gloriously*, was magnified, extolled, lifted up. But tho he dares not deny, that the original words are capable of this Translation, he finds fault with it as a false *Sense*; because (saith he) on the contrary, the Gospel was derided and despised, both by the Jews and Gentiles. We deny not, that *wicked* and *interessed* Persons, both of the Jews and Gentiles, opposed the Gospel: but we certainly know, it was so received in most places, if not in all; that St. *Paul* had reason here to say, it was gloriously entertained and magnified. Himself tells us, that having preached the Mystery of the Gospel, to the Galatian Nation; they were so affected with it, that *they would have given to him their very Eyes*; Gal. 4. 15. St. *Luke* in his *Acts* of the Apostles, witnesses that *throughout all* Asia, *the Name of the Lord Jesus was magnified*; Acts 19. 10, 17. As concerning the Jews, 'tis said of them, at *Acts* 21. 20. that *many thousands* (in the Greek 'tis many ten thousands) *of them believed:* and what is more marvellous, at Acts 6. 7. *A great Company* (even) *of the Priests were obedient to the Faith.*

Our Author therefore might have spared his false and impious Scurrility upon the Gospel, when he saith at *Pag.* 68. *It was scorned and derided, both by Jews and Gentiles.* Had he no way to defend his Cause, but by an Insult on the Gospel it self?

I know not, Sir, what stronger or clearer Proofs any Man can require, that this Text was anciently read, by *WHICH* (which Mystery of Godliness) *was manifested by Flesh: i. e.* by *Man*, as the Law had been by Angels? For you see, we have for this reading, *first* all the ancient Translations, the Latin, Armenian and Syriac; *then* the Council of *Nice*, so much extolled and reverenced by our Opposers: besides these, the Testimony of Trinitarian Historians, Men of Learning and Dignity, and contemporary to the Corruption of this Text; also a vast number of the best and oldest Copies of the Original Greek, and the Judgment of the ablest Criticks upon them.

If all this does not amount to a *Demonstration* on our side, in the Judgment of indifferent Persons; yet there is no Man of common Prudence and Caution, but will allow, that the reading for which our Adversaries contend, (*GOD was manifested in Flesh*) is too uncertain, doubtful and precarious, to build on it (as the Trinitarians do) an Article of Faith; or to innovate in the Doctrine of the Unity of God, dictated to us by Natural Light, and *the principal Design of both the Testaments.*

2. But supposing now this Point were yielded to them, that we are to read here, *GOD* was manifested in (or *by*) Flesh; it will nothing avail the Trinitarian Cause. For by *GOD* here we may understand, as in divers other Texts the Trinitarians themselves

selves do, not *the Person*, but *the Will* and Mind of God: this was manifested to us by Flesh, that is, by *Men*, by Jesus Christ and his Apostles.

'Tis true, our Translators render the words by, *was manifested IN Flesh*; but they will not deny, that they might have been rendred, *Manifested BY Flesh*: for themselves so *interpret* the Greek Particle, in the very next Clause of this Verse, *was justified IN the Spirit*; that is, say They, was Justified (or Proved) *by* the Spirit, by Miracles done by the Spirit of God.

That the word *God* may be sometimes interpreted, not of *the Person*, but of *the Will* or Mind of God; is not denied by the Trinitarian Interpreters; nay themselves, as I said before, so interpret. Thus, for Example; when St. *Paul* saith, *Gal.* 1. 10. *Do I now perswade Men, or God?* Our Opposers interpret it, thus; Do I seek to perswade *Human* Inventions, the Devices and Figments of *Men*, or the very *Will and Commands of God?* The like on divers other Texts.

Therefore, Sir, if Mr. *Milb.* has prevailed with you, to read this first Clause by, *God was manifested*; you may for all that, abide in your Sentiment about the Unity of God; and interpret to him the whole Verse, after this manner.

" Without Controversy, Great and Glorious is the Mystery of Godliness, even " the Gospel of the Blessed Jesus; for 'tis " no less or other, than the Will and Nature of God manifested to us, by the Agreeable and suitable Ministry of *Men*, of " *Flesh* and Blood like to our selves: not as " *the Law* was, by the Amazing and Terrible appearance of Flaming Ministers, " even the *Spirits* and Angels of Heaven. " This *Will of God* (or this Revelation of " his Nature and Will) has been *justified* " (*i. e.* proved) by the Spirit; by Miracles done by the Spirit, Energy or Power " of God: it has been *seen* and admired by " Angels, who desire to look more accurately into this New Revelation, which " (in part) supersedes the Revelation of " the Divine Will that was delivered by " them: it has been *Preached* to the Gentiles; and *Believed on* in the World. Did " I say, it has been Believed on? it has " not been *Barely* Believed, but received " (generally speaking) *with great Honour* " *and Glory*.

From *P.* 82. where our Author takes leave of this famous Text, to *P.* 309. He mortifies his Reader, with a long Impertinence, concerning the *Reasonableness* and *Usefulness* of Mysteries, in Religion: and that, 'twas Necessary the Messias should be the Son of God.

We are not concerned, in the Truth or Falshood of either of these Affirmations of our Author: be it, as He says; thô his Allegations (or any He can bring) prove neither of them; What are they to his Purpose?

If Mysteries are indeed so useful in Religion, as he contends they are; it will not follow from thence, that we must admit, as parts of our Religion, all the Mysteries that fanciful or ignorant Men have devised; much less that we are obliged, to let all the *Nonsense* and *Contradictions*, that Any may seek to impose on our Faith, pass for *Holy* and *Divine* Mysteries.

That 'twas *Necessary*, that the Messias should be *the Son of God*, I doubt very much; and I think, our Author has offer'd nothing in proof of it, that is Considerable or Material: but that *de Facto* it was so, that our Lord Christ was indeed the Son of God, the Socinians have always Granted and Affirmed; because he was begotten by the Divine Power on a pure Virgin.

Therefore overpassing so much useless Scrible of this Author, I come to his *second Particular* (as He calls it) at *P.* 309. That *the Blessed Jesus was so the Son of God, as to be God equal with his Father*; or, *was really and truly God, as well as real Man.*

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

THAT our Lord Jesus Christ was true God, Equal with his Father; our Author undertakes to prove, 1. From Texts of the Old Testament. 2. From Texts of the New Testament. 3. By the Actions and Miracles, done by the said our Lord Jesus. 4. From the Consent of the Primitive Church. 5. From the Common and (as he saith) *on every hand Approved* practice, of worshipping and praying to him.

His Proofs from the Old Testament, accurately examined.

He alledges, First, the History of the *Three* Angels, who at *Gen.* 18. appeared to *Abraham.* One of these Angels is called *Jehovah*, both by *Abraham* and by the Historian: but the Name Jehovah (which our Translators render LORD) is, saith our Author, communicable only to God; and that this Angel was indeed God, appears farther by *Abraham*'s calling him (at *V.*18.) *the Judg of the whole Earth.*

He saith hereupon; that by this History we gain the Certainty, that our Saviour had a Being before he was born of the Virgin: and that the Title, Power and Acknowledgments, belonging to the True God, are given to Christ.

But all this while, Mr. *Milb.* you forget *the one thing Necessary*; even to prove to us that this Angel, or this Jehovah, is the same Person that afterwards (in Gospel-times) is called the Lord Jesus. When you evince that, your Allegation of this History, will indeed be a Proof of the *Pre-existence* of our Saviour: till then, we remain in that (seemingly) rational Belief, that *his Mother was Older than He.*

But neither can we grant to you, that this Angel was indeed God; because the Name *Jehovah* is given to him: for that Name is bestowed (in Holy Scripture) on Angels, when they are appointed to represent the Person of God; as we shall (presently) see is confessed, by some of the principal Critics of the Trinitarians themselves, and all the Jewish Interpreters. Nay, the Name *Jehovah* is given to such *Places* and *Things*, as well as Persons; as God has honoured with his Presence, or with his particular Favour and Protection. See the *Br. History of the Unitarians*, on *Jerem.* 23. 5, 6. and on *Zech.* 3. 2.

But He observes, that the Angel here is called *the Judg of the whole Earth*; therefore He could be no other than God.

But, *first*, he might have noted too, that there is an Ambiguity in the Original Words; for they might have been rendred, *the Judg of a whole Land*: So that the Sense will be; Shall not He who is sent by God, to be the Judg of a whole Land, (*Sodom* and its Territory) be careful to do right; seeing otherways, such great numbers of People will receive extream Damage and Injury?

Secondly, Allowing the ordinary Translation; there is no Necessity to understand these words, concerning the Angel, but of God himself; so as to make this sense: Wilt thou destroy the Righteous, with the Wicked? that be far from thee. Shall not the Judg of the whole Earth, on whose Errand thou comest, and whose Delegat thou art, do right?

And *finally*, if the words are meant of the Angel himself; He is called *the Judg of the whole Earth*, in the same regard that He is called *Jehovah*: even because he *Represented* Jehovah the Judg of the whole Earth.

The Author to the *Hebrews*, refers to *Abraham*'s entertaining these Angels, in that Exhortation; Heb. 13. 2. *Forget not to entertain Strangers, for thereby some have entertained Angels.* How much more powerfully might

might this Holy Writer have recommended Hospitality to us; if He had been of Opinion (with our Author and his Party) that one of these Angels was God, or a Person of God? If he had so believed, would He have called to say; *Forget not to entertain Strangers, for some thereby have entertained God himself?*

So much on this Text.

Next, He cites the History of the Angel that met *Jacob* at *Peniel*, Gen. 32. 24. An Angel *met Jacob*, *wrestled* with him, and was *worsted* by him; and when he would have left him, *Jacob* would not suffer him to be gone, till he had Blessed him. Our Author saith, this Angel was God; for He would not tell his Name, which Angels (he saith) do not use to refuse: and *Jacob* prayed him to Bless him: and, finally, *Jacob* called the place of their Congress, *Peniel*, or the Face of God; *because I have seen* (El) *God, face to face*, Gen. 32. 4.

I never before, I confess, saw this place alledged in this Cause: and our Author has left us to Divine, what he would infer from it. But I suppose his meaning is, as on the former Text; that it follows from hence, that our Lord Christ had a Being, *before he was born of his Mother:* and that the Titles and Acknowledgments, belonging to God, are given to the Lord Christ. Therefore I answer too, as before; that He has again forgot the main thing, even to prove, that this Angel was (in process of Time) incarnate, and called Jesus Christ; of which he says not a word: as if we ought to take *that* for granted, which is the chief thing in question. I say also farther; that our Author's Allegations are very far from proving, that this Angel was God. He is indeed here called *El:* but *El* is a word used in Holy Scripture, indifferently of God, of Angels and of Men; as the English word LORD is.

Yet we are willing, that *El* should be here rendred *God:* for some of the most learned Interpreters and Critics, of the Trinitarian Perswasion, have ingenuously owned; that the Angel is here called God, *because He represented God.* So *Menochius* and *Tirinus* in Mr. *Pool*'s Collection.

But should I grant to our Author; that this Angel was *true God:* He would gain nothing by that Concession. For this Concertation between *Jacob* and the Angel, (as that between the Angel and *Balaam*, recorded *Numb.* 22. 22, *&c.*) was only Spiritual, or in *Vision*; not Corporal and *in Reality:* as besides the Jewish Interpreters, is owned by St. *Jerom*, the Interlineary Gloss, by St. *Thomas* and *Rupertus*.

Jacob had this Vision to comfort and animate him, and to assure him of God's Presence with him; when He should meet with his Brother *Esau:* but that He might know, the Vision was really from God; he was made to Halt on that Leg, which in the Vision had been touched by the Angel. This Interpretation is Rational; because a Man could not really have prevailed, as the History says *Jacob* did, against an Angel; much less (as our Author so *oddly*, that I say no worse, supposes) against God.

His *Third* place, out of the Old Testament, is; Psal. 45. 6, 7. *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*, &c. He noteth, that these remarkable Words are applied to our Saviour, by the Author of the *Hebrews*, Heb. 1. 8, 9. *To the Son, He saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*, &c.

The Author of the *Brief History of the Unitarians*, answers, in short; that the words both in the Hebrew and the Greek, both in the Psalm and in the Epistle, might have been *rendred*, and *interpreted* after this manner: God is thy Throne (*i.e.* thy Seat, resting Place, or *thy Establishment*) *for ever and ever*. And so it is, that the Illustrious *Grotius* Translates, and understands both these Texts.

But let us allow the Translation in our English Bibles, *Thy Throne* (*O God*) *is for ever and ever*. For understanding this Passage, and indeed the whole Psalm; some

Learned

Learned Interpreters have well noted, that this Psalm is an *Epithalamium*, or Marriage-Song to *Solomon* and *Sulamitis* Daughter of *Pharaoh*. It was sung by the Bride-Maids, saith *Grotius*, *In honorem novi mariti Solomonis, & novæ Nuptiæ Filiæ Regis Ægypti*; *In Gratulation to the Bridegroom and Bride*, Solomon *and the Daughter of* Pharaoh. Dr. *Patrick* says, that most Interpreters conclude, this Psalm was composed on occasion of the Marriage of *Solomon* with *Pharaoh*'s Daughter.

Any one that reads the Psalm without Prejudice, will plainly see, that the Interpreters, of whom Dr. *Patrick* speaks, and whom he confesses to be *the most*, have rightly conjectured concerning this Psalm; namely, that 'tis a Marriage-Song to *Solomon* and his Egyptian Bride. It begins, *I will speak of* (or I will *rehearse*) *the things which I have made concerning the King*. Then the Poet proceeds to describe, and wish well to the King: *Thou art fairer than the Children of Men, Grace is poured on thy Lips; thy Garments smell of Myrrh, Alloes and Cassia, out of the Ivory Palaces*, or Boxes. He adds, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*; *i. e.* Thou sittest on the Throne of *David*, which is to endure *for ever*; for some descended from him (so God has promised) shall sit thereon, till it comes to the Messias, or Christ; whose Kingdom shall be not only universal, as to place, but shall last *for ever and ever*. After these things said to *Solomon*, the Poem addresses to the Queen, *Hear, O Daughter, forget thy own People and thy Father's House, so shall the King greatly desire thy Beauty. Instead of thy Fathers, shall be thy Children; whom thou mayst make Princes in all the Earth*, or rather *in all this Land: q. d.* Thou mayst make them Governours of Tribes in all the Land of *Canaan*.

Our Opposers catch at the word *God*; *thy Torone, O God, is for ever and ever*: as if because of that word, it were necessary to suppose, that both the Psalmist and the Author to the Hebrews do speak of such a Person, as is really and truly God. But why have they not noted, what our Saviour tells them, that those also are called *Gods* in Scripture, *To whom the Word of God comes*, Joh. 10. 35. that is to say, Judges, Magistrates, and especially Princes are called *Gods*, because they hold the Place of God, and act by his general Commission granted to them in his Word. For Proof of which Observation, he alledges the words of *Psal.* 82. 6. concerning the Magistracy and Princes of *Israel*, *I have said, Ye are Gods*. In a word, *Solomon* is in this Psalm saluted by the Name of *God*, according to the known Language of those Times and Countries, to Magistrates and Princes: and what had been said to *Solomon*, is by St. *Paul* to the Hebrews, applied or accommodated to the Great (Spiritual) King, the Messias or Christ; because it might (even) more properly be said of him than of *Solomon*, even this saying, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*. Nay, we may allow, that he more than applies the words; we may say, he *interprets* them of Christ; because the Psalm being composed by a *Prophetical* Poet, at the same time that he courted and praised *Solomon*, he might prophesy of the Lord Christ. This account of these words, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever*, being so generally approved by the more learned Criticks of the Trinitarians; I cannot but wonder, that this Text should be urged by any at this time of the day, as a Proof that the Lord Christ is true God, equal to the Eternal and Almighty Father of all, the dread Creator of Heaven and Earth. If it prooves the Lord Christ to be such, it proves the same of *Solomon*, even in the Opinion of the most judicious of our Opposers.

A *fourth* Proof of our Author, is, *Heb.* 1. 6. *When he* (God) *bringeth his First-begotten into the World, he saith*, (or he commandeth) *Let all the Angels of God worship him*. His Argument from hence, is this, the Charge so often repeated in Scripture, of worshipping God only, obliges Angels as well as Men: seeing therefore they are required to worship

worship our Lord Christ, it follows that he is true God.

But our Author is greatly mistaken, when he saith that the words, *Let all the Angels of God worship him*, are taken from *Psal.* 97. 7. they are taken from the LXX Translation of *Deut.* 32. 43. where the LXX (whose Translation is followed generally by the Writers of the New Testament, and more especially by the Author of this Epistle throughout) read Προσκυνησατωσαν αυτῳ παντες οἱ ἀγγελοι Θεοῦ, *Let all the Angels of God worship him*; the very words of the Author to the Hebrews. But at *Psal.* 97. 7. from whence Mr. *Milbourn* would fetch this Quotation, 'tis only said, *Worship him all ye Gods*; and the words are by Interpreters commonly understood of the Gods or Demons worshipp'd by the Heathen Nations. Furthermore, it has been observed by some Trinitarian Criticks, that *Justin Martyr*, *Theodoret*, *Epiphanius*, and St. *Austin* (all very ancient) quote these words, *Let all the Angels of God worship him*, as taken from the LXX Translation of *Deut.* 32. 43. tho the words are wanting in the present Hebrew Copies of the Bible, and therefore also in our English Bibles, as are divers other Passages of the Old Testament, cited by the Writers of the New.

The words in that Text of *Deuteronomy*, are spoken of the Nation of *Israel*; the Nations are there bid to *rejoice* with, and the Angels to *worship Israel*; that is, to guard, serve and watch over him. But these words intended originally of *Israel*, are, by the Author to the Hebrews, accommodated and applied likewise to the Lord Christ; because the Angels had in charge to succour and *minister* to him also. Yet not to him only, but to all his Brethren, *Heb.* 1. 14. *They are all Ministring Spirits, sent forth to minister to such as shall be Heirs of Salvation.*

We have just such another Accommodation, or Application of a Text to our Saviour, which was originally meant of the Nation of *Israel*, at *Matth.* 2. 15. there the Evangelist saith, that Jesus was brought by *Joseph* (his Foster-Father) out of *Egypt*, into *Judea*; and so, saith he, was fulfilled the Word of God by the Prophet, *Out of* Egypt *I have called my Son.* But any one that looks into the Context of the Prophet, will plainly see, that those words were originally meant and designed of the People of *Israel*, whom God there vouchsafes to call his Son. The words of the Prophet are these, *Hosea* 11. 1. *When* Israel *was a Child*, (*i. e.* in the first Ages of that People) *then I loved him, and called my Son out of* Egypt.

Therefore when such Texts are either *interpreted* of Christ, or *accommodated* and *applied* to him, we are to understand it after this manner; that those Texts were *again* fulfilled, or had *a second* Completion in the Person of our Lord Christ.

But our Author urges, that the Precept of worshipping only God, obliges Angels and Men; therefore how could the Angels be required to worship Christ, if he were not true God?

It seems then, he has not observed what is said at 1 *Chron.* 29. 20. *The Congregation blessed the Lord God of their Fathers; and bowing the Head, they worshipped the Lord and the King.* Nor has he noted, how often divers Persons worshipp'd our Saviour while he was upon Earth. The meaning is not, that they worshipp'd either *David* or our Saviour with *Divine* Worship, but with a *Civil* and *Religious* Worship, such as is due to Kings and to Prophets on the account of him that sent them. The Lord Christ has an Office, that of King and Head of the Church, higher than any Angel; nay, so high, that he may make use of the Ministry of Angels in the Execution of his Office: therefore they are bid to worship him, not with *Divine* Worship, (no more than they were to worship *Israel* with such Worship) but with the Worship or *Respect* that is due to him in regard of his Office; as the Congregation worshipp'd *David*, in the Text last quoted, in regard of his Kingdom or Royal Dignity. But, as I observed

 before,

before, the Worship principally meant in the words, *Let all the Angels of God worship him*, is to be understood of succouring and ministring to him, while he was upon Earth, as they were to worship *Israel*.

CHAP. III.

Continuation of the Examination of the Texts, objected from the Old Testament.

OUR Author's *fifth* Objection is from *Heb.* 1. 10, 11, 12. (words taken from *Psal.* 102. 25, 26, 27.) *And thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth; and the Heavens are the Works of thy Hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: they shall wax old as does a Garment; And as a Vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy Years fail not.* Let us add the next words, at *vsr.* 13. *But to which of the Angels said he at any time, Sit at my Right-hand, until I make thine Enemies thy Foot-stool?*

He saith, these words here cited, to *v.* 13. are intended of the Son our Lord Christ; and that by ascribing to him the Creation of the Heavens and Earth, they assure us, both of the Pre-eternity and the Divinity of the said our Lord Christ.

We have seen before, that the Writers of the New Testament do accommodate divers Passages and Expressions of the Old Testament to our Saviour; tho originally, and in their primary Intention, they were meant of other Persons; because such Passages and Expressions had *another*, and a *second* Completion, in the Person of the Lord Christ. Thus, what was said of *Solomon*, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*, is applied to our Saviour, because he also has an everlasting Throne: and what was said of *Israel*, *Out of* Egypt *I have called my Son*, is too accommodated to Christ; because he likewise was called out of *Egypt*, after the Death of *Herod*. In like sort, in this Context to the Hebrews, what had been said by the Psalmist, of God, and of the old or *first* Creation, (*Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thy Hands*, &c.) is accommodated to the Lord Christ, and to the *new* Creation which he hath made, even *the new Heavens and the new Earth, in which* (as St. *Peter* says of them) *dwelleth Righteousness*.

The Gospel-state and Times, or the *Church* in opposition to the *Synagogue* and Jewish Oeconomy, is described very often in Scripture, under the Names of the New Heavens and New Earth. *Isa.* 65. 17. *Behold, I create new Heavens, and a new Earth; and the former shall be remembred no more. Isa.* 66. 22. *As the new Heavens and the new Earth, which I will make, shall remain before me; so shall your Seed and your Name remain.* St. *Peter*, after he had described the fearful Dissolution of the Jewish Oeconomy and State, in terms much like those used by our Saviour on the same occasion and Subject, at *Mat.* 24. adds, 2 *Pet.* 3. 13. *Nevertheless, according to his Promise, we look for new Heavens and a new Earth, wherein dwelleth Righteousness.* That is, a new Oeconomy and State, in which not so much a *Ceremonial*, as a *Moral* and true Righteousness, shall be taught and practised. Rev. 21. 1. *I saw a new Heaven, and a new Earth; for the first Heaven and the first Earth were passed away.* i. e. He saw *the Church*, or Christian Oeconomy begin; the Jewish or old Oeconomy, or Law was abolished.

All the Trinitarian Interpreters do thus understand these Texts; namely, that by the

the New Heavens and New Earth is meant the Gospel-state of things, in opposition to the Jewish, which is antiquated and done away. This is the Earth, and these the Heavens, of which the Lord Christ is the Maker, under God; partly by Himself, partly by his Apostles and other true Ministers of the Gospel: and these the Author to the *Hebrews* meaneth, when he says here, of our Lord Christ; *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundations of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thy Hands: they shall be changed*, (from their state of Probation and Trial, to a state of Perfection and Enjoyment) *but thou remainest for ever the same.*

The most Learned *Grotius*, whose Interpretation this is, rightly observes; that the *Hebrews*, to whom this Epistle was written, did commonly speak of the Times of the Messias (or Christ) in these very terms here used: namely, that He should *make another World, New* Heavens and Earth; meaning thereby, a Total change of the face of things, in the Church and Religion. And those Forms of speaking, they borrowed from the Prophet *Isaiah*; whose words I have before quoted. Therefore in writing to them, it was no surprize to them; that this Epistle should accommodate the words of the *Prophetical* Psalmist, used by him concerning God and the *first* Creation, to the Messias and the *New* Creation; because in him they had *Another*, and *Second* Completion.

Others of our Party, give other Accounts of this Text; this for one; that the words, *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundations of the Earth*, &c. are not at all (in any sense) intended of *our Saviour*; but are a devout Apostrophe Conversion or Address to *God*, that is, to the Father; so as to make this sense. "And truly thou, Lord, "who hast thus anointed and exalted thy "Son, art the God who hast laid the Foun-"dations of the Earth; and the Heavens are "the Work of thy Hands:——But to "which of his Angels, hath this Glorious "and *Unchangeable* Creator at any time "said; as He doth by the Inspired and "*Prophetical* Psalmist to the Son our Lord "Christ; Sit on my right Hand, till I make "thy Enemies thy Foot-stool? Here we ought to note, that the words, *Sit at my right Hand, till I make thy Enemies thy Foot-stool*, are originally and primarily intended of *David*; as is owned by the Trinitarian Interpreters: but they are applied to Christ in this Context to the *Hebrews*, because they are also *a Prophecy of him*; and of what God would do for him. In a word, their meaning, *with respect to the Lord Christ*, is this; God hath (*in his Decree*) said concerning the Messias or Christ, who shall in due time be manifested, *Sit on my right hand, till I make thy Enemies thy Footstool*: This is the Sense of the words, as they stand in the Psalm. See the Learned Dr. *Patrick*'s Paraphrase and Notes, on *Psal.* 110. 1.

I do not wonder, Sir, that our Opposer took no notice of these two Interpretations of these words, *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth*, &c. they were too Rational and Probable, to be set in the same Light and View with the *Wild* Construction, that He and his Party make of this Context. For they make this Author to the *Hebrews*, to say; that the Lord Christ is the Creator of the *Visible* Earth and Heavens: and yet that 'tis Another Person, that must subdue to him the Enemies of his Kingdom, and make them his Foot-stool.

I had almost forgot, Sir, to tell you; that as *Grotius* is the Author of the first Interpretation, which I have given of this Context; so 'tis *Thomas Aquinas*, surnamed the *Angelical* Doctor, thus has observed and suggested the other.

He alledgeth *next* (tho not out of the Old Testament, according to his proposed Method) Heb. 1. 1, 2. *God who at sundry times—spake to the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in those last times spoken to us by his Son; by whom also He made the Worlds.* Our Author is not pleased to take notice, that *Grotius*

tius renders the last Clause by, *For whom also He made the Worlds: i. e.* the World was at first made, with intention to subject it (in the fulness of Time) to the Messias and his Law. And the Author to the *Hebrews*, rather chose to say here, *The World was made for the Messias*; because it was a common Saying among the Jews, a part of their Doctrine and Belief concerning the Messias: there is nothing more common in their Books, than this Saying, The World was made for the Messiah, who shall be.

Nor has our Opposer thought fit to observe, that some of the best Critics of his own Party, have thus rendred the objected Text; *By whom also he made the AGES:* and that they interpret *the AGES* to be *the Gospel-Ages*; which were made by the Ministry of our Lord Christ. No, these were Interpretations, which 'twas better for him to overlook, than to attempt, in vain, to refute them.

His *seventh* Proof is from *Isa. 9. 6. Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given;——his Name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.*

He saith, this Text is *universally* applied to the Blessed Jesus; and that 'tis strange, that he should be called *the Mighty God*, if He is not God at all. He saith farther, that *Everlasting Father* could not without Absurdity be applied to the Lord Christ; if as the Socinians say of him, there was *a time when He was not.*

To this, the Author of the *Brief History* hath Answered, that this Text of the Prophet is *Never* applied to our Saviour, by any Writer of the New Testament: thô Mr. *Milb.* is pleased here to say, 'tis universally applied to him. The Historian shows the Reason, why the Writers of the New Testament have not applied this Text to the Lord Christ; because it apparently speaks of one, actually born at that time when the Prophet wrote; *Unto us a Child IS born, unto us a Son IS given*; but the Prophet wrote about 700 Years before the Birth of our Saviour. He adds, that *Grotius* and divers others (Christian and Orthodox, as well as Jewish Interpreters) understand the Text, of *Hezekiah*, afterwards King of *Judah*; and that it hath been Translated very extravagantly into English.

The truth is, there are almost as many Translations of this Verse, as there are Interpreters. Instead of the words, *Counsellor, the Mighty God*; the LXX Interpreters say, *the Angel* (or Messenger) *of Great Counsel*; *i. e.* the Wise Messenger: they wholly omit the following words, even these, *the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, &c.* those words (it should seem) have been added since their time, to the Hebrew Copies of the Bible.

The Fathers generally follow this Translation of the LXX. *M. Luther*, who understood the Hebrew very well, instead of *Mighty God*, saith, *the Mighty Hero*, or Warriour. *Grotius* saith, *the Consulter of the Mighty God*; and interprets thus, *Hezekiah* shall consult with God, not with the Idols of his Father *Ahaz*, both in his Enterprises and his Troubles. For *Everlasting Father*, St. *Hierom* and other Critics read, *the Father of the Age*; and for *the Prince of Peace*, they read *the Peaceable Prince*: because *Hezekiah* would not enterprize Needless Wars; but seek to maintain the Peace, Property and Plenty of his People.

When the words in the Original (Hebrew or Greek) are of such doubtful and ambiguous Construction; 'tis the manner of our Opposers, to take that Occasion, to set up their *Wonders*: We, on the contrary, affect not *Monstrositas*; but are governed by the obvious Reason and Possibilities of things. We think, 'tis enough to determine us to some or other of the *Reasonable* and *Possible* Senses, before-mentioned; that the Writers of the New Testament never apply this Text to our Saviour; and because the Prophet so plainly speaks of a Child *then* born, *Unto us a Child IS born, unto us a Son IS given.*

His

His *eighth* Text from the Old Testament, is, Jerem. 23. 5, 6. *The days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise up to* David *a Righteous Branch*;——*in his days,* Judah *shall be saved, and* Israel *shall dwell safely: and this is the Name whereby He shall be called, The LORD our Righteousness.* This BRANCH, saith our Author, is by Rabbins and Fathers interpreted to be the Messias or Christ: and that He is *God*, appears by the Name here given to him, *Jehovah Tsidkenu*, or *the Lord our Righteousness.* And agreeable to this Interpretation, the Apostle saith, 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. *The Lord Christ is of God made to us, Wisdom and Righteousness, Sanctification and Redemption.*

Our Author's first and great Mistake here, is this; that on Supposition, that 'tis the Lord Christ who is here called *the Lord our Righteousness*, He must needs be true God. For let us hear another Text of this Prophet, Jerem. 33. 16. *In those days* Judah *shall be saved, and* Jerusalem *shall dwell safely; and this is the Name wherewith SHE* (Jerusalem) *shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness.* We see by this last Text, that *the Lord our Righteousness* in the other Text, is not meant of the *Branch*, (whether that Branch be the Lord Christ, as our Author *thinks*; or *Zorobabel*, as *Grotius* has *proved*) but *Israel*, the Nation of *Israel*: So that we ought to understand the objected Text, after this manner. " In those days, " I will raise up to *David*, a Righteous " Branch;—and in his time *Judah* shall be " saved, and *Israel* shall dwell safely; and " this is the Name, wherewith He (*Israel*, " not *the Branch*) shall be called, *The Lord* " *our Righteousness.*

'Tis promised here in these Texts, that *Israel* and *Jerusalem* shall be called, *the Lord our Righteousness*; in the days of *Zorobabel*, who was their Governour (Vice-King for the King of *Babylon*) immediately after the return from the Captivity: because it would then please God, to pardon all the past Sins of that People, and to deal with them as a *Righteous* People; notwithstanding their former Transgressions, and *National* Revolts from him.

Others have observed, that the words in both Contexts, may be rendred *the Lord our Justifier*; or the Lord *is* our Justifier: and so they make this Sense; In the Days of the Branch, in the Government of *Zorobabel* of the House of *David*; God will justify and deliver us, from all our Adversaries and Persecutors.

His *last* Old Testament Text, is *Mich.* 5. 2. *Thou* Bethlehem,—*out of thee shall come forth unto me, that is to be Ruler in* Israel; *whose goings forth have been from Old, from Everlasting*; or, *from the Days of Eternity.* He noteth, that this Text is Interpreted of the Lord Christ; even by the chief Priests and Scribes of the Jews, *Matth.* 2. 4, 5, 6.

Thô our Author had not Designed to take notice, what the Heterodox Socinians Answer, in defence of their Doctrine of *the Unity of God*; or how They interpret the Texts, objected to that *Heresy* of theirs: yet at least Mr. *Calvin* was worthy to be heard. This famous Reformer owns, that the Prophet's meaning is only this; the Goings forth of the Lord Christ have been *Decreed by God*, from the Days of Eternity.

But *Grotius* instead of *From Everlasting*, or from the Days of Eternity, hath Translated here *from ancient Days*; and so (All know) the words may be rendred: therefore he maketh the Sense to be this; Whose Goings forth (*i. e.* whose *Descent*, Original, or Pedigree) is of Old, from Ancient Times. For Christ is *come* of that most Ancient Stock of *David*, of the Town of *Bethlehem.*

Our Author may please, in his next, to try his Skill on these Solutions: in the mean time, I pass to what He hath objected from the New Testament.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

On his Texts out of the Gospels.

THEY are not many Texts, Sir, on which our Author has insisted to prove his Proposition, that our Lord Christ is *true God*; but He assures us (at *P.* 309.) they are *Choice* Ones: We have considered those He alledges from the Old Testament, let us now examine what He hath urged out of the New.

On the Texts of St. Matthew.

He begins with *Matth.* 1. 22, 23. *This was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord, by the Prophet, saying, A Virgin shall Conceive, and shall bring forth a Son; and they shall call his Name Immanuel; which being interpreted, is, God with us.*

He notes, that these words are spoken of the Lord Christ; and that the Name *Immanuel* (or *God with us*) has been *appropriated* to him, by God: for we no where find, that He hath given this Name to any other. But where God giveth a Name, and the Spirit of God interprets it; it cannot be insignificant: from whence it follows, that the Lord Christ is indeed *God Eternal*, and *God with us*.

To this, I say; thô the Consonants of the Hebrew Name *Immanuel* may be so *Pointed*, that the Name may be Interpreted *God with Him*; which would turn the Objection from this Text, upon our Opposers: yet *that* is not here to be insisted on; because we shall see presently, that in giving that Name, it was really intended, the Child should be called or named *God with Us*. The Text here objected out of St. *Matthew*, is taken from *Isa.* 7. where that Prophet tells *Ahaz* King of *Judah*, who was at that time invaded by the Confederate Kings of *Syria* and *Israel*; that the Confederacy of these two Kings against *Judah*, should in the end come to nothing: and that *Israel* should be destroyed from being any longer a Nation, within the term of 65 Years. And for a Sign to you, says the Prophet, that God will bring this to pass; a Virgin (one who at present is a Virgin) shall forthwith Conceive by her Husband, and bring forth a Son, whom God will have to be called *Immanuel*, or *God with Us*: because before this Child is of Years of Discretion to know Good and Evil, God will indeed appear to be on our Side; He will withdraw by Death the two Kings, who are Confederate against us. There is no Learned Critic that doubts, that the Child here promised by the Prophet to be a Sign of the Truth of what He had said, about the Confederacy of the Two Kings, and the final Destruction of the Kingdom of *Israel*, is *Maher-Shalal-Hashbaz*, Son of this Prophet, by the Wife whom (it should seem) He had lately taken: And They observe, that this is the Reason, why he saith in the next Chapter; *I and the Children whom the Lord hath given me, are for Signs in* Israel, *from the Lord*, Isa. 8. 18. But whether the Child *Immanuel* was the Son of the Prophet, or of some other; this is certain, that He was to be a Sign to King *Ahaz*, and to the People of *Israel* and *Judah*. This Child being to be such a Sign, the Sign of so favourable a Providence to *Judah* and *Ahaz*, had an Answerable Name given to him by order from God; even *Immanuel*, or *God with Us*. Therefore our Author's First Observation is certainly false; that the Name *Immanuel* was *Appropriated* to the Lord Christ, and *no where* given by God to any other Person. And so too is his other Note, that because God gave to him the Name *Immanuel*, He must needs be *true God*; for God gave the same Name

Name to the Child that was to be a Sign to *Ahaz* and *Judah*, that God would be *with them* (or *for them*) by destroying their Enemies, the Syrians and Israelites.

We see that the words of the Prophet were originally intended, of a Child that was to be a Sign to *Ahaz* and *Judah*; and that there was a good reason why that Name should be given to him. But St. *Matthew* accommodates and applies both the Prophecy and the Name to our Lord Christ, because in him they had *another* and a *second* Completion; we may say, *a more perfect* Completion. For the Lord Christ was our *Immanuel*, or *God with us*; not only as he was *a Sign* that God would be on our side, which was the only reason of the Name of the first *Immanuel*; but because he did really conciliate God to us, and us to God; and because God was *with* him, and *in* him, by an extraordinary Effusion of his Spirit upon him.

No one can be so blind or obstinate, as not to acknowledg, that this Interpretation (which indeed is not ours, but advanced by divers of the principal Trinitarian Interpreters) is easy and rational, perfectly agreeable to the scope of the Prophet; and also to the manner of writing observed by this, and the other Evangelists; who very usually apply divers Texts of the Old Testament, intended originally of other Persons, to the Lord Christ; because in him they had a second and (very often) a more perfect fulfilling. Therefore let our Oppofers show cause why we should depart from an Interpretation every way reasonable, to imbrace and adhere to theirs; which implies a Doctrine contrary to the first Commandment, and to the whole Current of Scripture, even this, that there is more than one Divine Person, or more than one who is true God.

His *second* Argument is from *Mat.* 28. 19. *Teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* He observes here, that the Son and Spirit are set *equally* with the Father, as Objects of our Baptismal Faith; which either proves their real Equality, or is of dangerous Import, for 'tis apt to impress upon us false Notions of the Deity, and to make us think those to be really equal, who are not so. He saith moreover, that in other Texts where God is joined with his Creatures; a distinction is made, whereby to discern that one is God, and the other but Creatures; but not so in this Text; we are bid here to be baptized, equally and alike to the Father, Son and Spirit, without any Note of Dignity or Superiority in one more than in another of them; therefore they must be understood to be equal.

It may be our Author knows not, that some Learned Criticks have given very strong Reasons why they believe, that these words of the objected Text, *In the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit*, were not spoke by our Saviour, but have been added to the Gospel of St. *Matthew*, from the common *Form* and Practice of the Church in administring Baptism; as 'tis certain that these words, *For thine is the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory for ever*, have been added to the Lord's-Prayer in the same Gospel of St. *Matthew*, from the Greek Liturgies or Forms of Common-Prayer. These Criticks observe, that Cardinal *Bellarmine* is very angry with the Unitarians who maintained the Dispute at *Alba*; because they said, those words were added to the Bible but only since the *Nicene* Council had corrupted the Faith; all Antiquity, saith the Cardinal, is witness against them, that those words were always read in the Gospel of St. *Matthew*. But the Learned Cardinal does not produce one Testimony, in Confirmation of what he says, tho he uses to be very free in his Quotations of Fathers, and ancient Ecclesiastical Historians. In short, we have nothing but Cardinal *Bellarmine*'s word for it, that the Ancients did read the words, *In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*.

Whereas some pretend to find these words cited by St. *Ignatius*, as spoken by

our Saviour, in the Epistle of the said *Ignatius* to the Philippians: that Epistle is (all of it) a meer Forgery, by Confession of all the Criticks who have publish'd the Works of *Ignatius*, or have written Notes upon them. They observe, that Epistle is never quoted by any of the Ancients, nor was heard of in the World before *Ado Viennensis*, who flourish'd about the Year 859.

Eusebius, the famous Ecclesiastical Historian, quotes the objected Text *nine* times in several parts of his Works, but never with the words, *In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; he reads thus, *Teach all Nations in my Name, instructing them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*

The constant Practice of the ancient Unitarians, was, to baptize only *in the Name of the Lord Christ*; and therefore it was ordered by the Councils of *Nice* and *Laodicea*, that the Paulinists (*i. e.* the Unitarians) who came over to the Church, should be re-baptized. Whether they or the Catholick Church (so called) are in the right concerning the Form of Baptism, is best determined from the Practice of the Apostles: for we cannot well suppose, that if the Form prescribed by our Saviour himself, was, *In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*, that the Apostles would depart from that Form; or that 'twas lawful for them so to do. But where-ever there is mention in Scripture-History, of the Administration of Baptism, either by the Apostles, or by their Order, the Form of such Baptism was only, *In the Name of the Lord Christ*; or, *Unto the Lord Christ*. Acts 2. 38. Peter *said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the Name of the Lord Jesus.* The same thing is said at *Acts* 8. 16. *Acts* 10. 48. *Acts* 19. 5. *Rom.* 6. 3. *Gal.* 3. 27. 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. Add to this, that besides the Schoolmen and other Moderns, St. *Basil*, St. *Hilary* and St. *Ambrose*, do expresly own, that the Apostles administred Baptism only in the Name of the Lord Jesus. Finally, the other Evangelists mention the Institution of Baptism by our Saviour after his Resurrection; but they say not, that he appointed it to be administred, *In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; which 'tis not likely they would have omitted, if our Saviour had injoined that Form of performing the Rite of Baptism. Nay, it should seem, by what St. *Luke* says, that the Form of Baptism appointed by our Saviour, was only in his (Christ's) Name, not in the Name of more Persons. *Luke* 24. 46, 47. *Jesus said unto them, that Repentance, and Remission of Sins should be preached in his Name, unto all Nations.* Here *Remission of Sins* seems to be no other thing but *Baptism* administred *in Christ's Name*, as a sign of the Remission of Sins; and therefore it is, that elsewhere instead of *Repentance* and *Remission of Sins*; the holy Writers say *Repentance* and *Baptism*: so St. *Peter* speaks, *Acts* 2. 38. *Repent, and be baptized, in the Name of the Lord Jesus.* To this effect speak the forementioned Criticks; and from hence they infer, that we cannot make use of this Text to warrant the Church's Form of Baptism, *In the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit*, much less to prove that the two latter are God (or *Gods*) equal with the Father.

I desire and resolve, Sir, to argue this great Question, concerning the Divinity of our Saviour; or, whether there is more than one Divine Person, with all possible sincerity: Therefore I will ingenuously own to you, that tho the before-mentioned Exceptions to this Text, are not without their weight; yet I have observed divers things, which make me to think, that this Text is a genuine part of Scripture, was spoken by our Saviour, and written by St. *Matthew*.

First, 'Tis found in all the Copies of the Bible, both *Printed* and *Manuscript*, and in all the ancient Translations, which cannot be said of any other Text, which is rejected by us or by our Opposers; all the doubtful and suspected Texts are wanting in divers Copies of the Original Greek, and of

of the Ancient Translations. I conceive, we ought not to argue against the Truth of any Text from only *Negative* Proofs, or from some *possible* Interpretations of other Texts, tho those Texts are perhaps *many*. It ought to be shown, that either Church-Historians or Fathers have said, that such Text was *not read*, or was *otherways read* in the Copies of their Times.

Secondly, To the Allegations out of the Acts of the Apostles, and some Epistles of St. *Paul*; it may be answered, That those Texts mention only *the Name of the Lord Jesus*, and not the other two Names, *the Father* and *the Holy Ghost*; because by *the Name of the Lord Jesus*, and *unto the Lord Jesus*, they mean, to the Profession of the Lord Jesus, and of the Doctrine by him taught, without at all intending to express by those words the *Form* of Baptism, which every one knew to be *In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. I like this Interpretation; because when St. *Paul* asked some Disciples at *Ephesus*, whether they had yet received the Holy Ghost? and they had answered, that they had not heard whether there was an Holy Ghost: He replies, *Unto what then were ye baptized? Acts* 19. 3. This Reply of the Apostle seems to suppose, that if they were baptized *with Christian Baptism*, (and not only with the Baptism of *John*) they must needs have heard of the Holy Ghost, because the Form was in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

Thirdly, The ancient Unitarians baptized only *in the Name of the Lord Christ*. I think 'tis grounded only on the Report of Pope *Innocent* I. who might not understand their Discipline, or designedly misreport it: and besides, his Epistles are supposed to be forged by most learned Men; because they make mention of Rites and Persons that were not in Being in *Innocent*'s time.

Lastly; Whereas the Unitarians at *Alba* said, that this Text has been added to St. *Matthew* since the first *Nicene* Council; tho Cardinal *Bellarmine* has only *denied* this, he might most easily have proved the contrary. For *Tertullian*, who flourish'd above 120 Years before the *Nicene* Council, often quotes this Text. In his Book concerning *Baptism*, Chap. 13. he saith, *The Law of baptizing is imposed, and the Form prescribed: Go*, saith he, *teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit*. And again, in his Book against *Praxeas*, Chap. 26. *After his Resurrection, he commanded, that they should baptize to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; not to one of them only.*

It is true, none of the Ante-Nicene Fathers do ever alledg this Form of Baptism, to prove the Divinity of the Son or Holy Spirit; but the reason of that was, because tho they allowed that the Son might be called *God*, on account of his perfect Conjunction (by Love, Unity of Will, and Subjection) with the Father, who only is true God; yet they thought otherwise of the Holy Ghost: some of them understanding him to be only the Energy, or Power of God; others that he was a Creature of the Son, and only the chief of the ministring Spirits or Angels. But to return to our Opposer.

He saith, We are baptized *alike* and *equally* to the Father, Son and Spirit; therefore the two *latter* are equal in all respects to the *former*, or, are God no less than he; they are mentioned *together* in this Text, without any Note of Dignity or Superiority in one more than in another; which were of dangerous Consequence, and apt to lead Men into Error, if only one of these is true God.

But, 1. 'Tis not true, that here is no Note of Distinction or Superiority; for the words at length are these; *All Power is given to me, in Heaven and Earth; go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit*. I would know of our Opposer, what greater Distinction could be made, than our Saviour here makes between God and himself? doth he not here expressly profess and own, that his Power is *given to him*;

him; that he hath *received it* from the Liberality of another, and not from himself? Can any one be said to give Power to himself? And the Apostle hath told us, how we are to understand it, that *all Power* is given to the Lord Christ; in these words to the *Ephesians*, God *gave to him to be Head over all things, to the Church*: Ephes. 1. 22. As who should say, He is over all things, and hath all Power, *with respect to the Church*: 'tis He, and He only that must prescribe her *standing* Laws and Rites; and appoint by what Persons, and what Means, the Church shall be first gathered, and then preserved.

2. But supposing now there had been no Note of Superiority here made, or Distinction of Dignity and Power; I see not what could be truly inferred from thence to the advantage of our Author's Cause. For when God is joined in the same form of Speech with any others; sure *that* needs not to be expressed, which all Men know and acknowledg, even God's Superiority above all others. 1 *Chron.* 29. 20. *The Congregation bowed their Heads, and worshipped the Lord, and the King.* 1 Tim. 5. 21. *I charge thee before God, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Elect Angels.* Rev. 22. 17. *The Spirit and the Bride say, Come.* Will our Author say upon these Texts, and upon that other (parallel) Text, 1 *Sam.* 12. 18. *All the People greatly feared the Lord, and* Samuel? Will he say, that *Samuel* and *David*, the Angels and the Bride (*i. e.* the Church) are equal with God or with the Spirit, because they are mentioned *together*, without any Note of Distinction, or of Dignity and Superiority in one more than in the other? The Acts of Religion mentioned in these Texts, are no less solemn or important than Baptism is; *fearing* the Lord, *worshipping* the Lord, *adjuring* by the Lord, are the very highest Acts of Devotion and Religion; yet even in them God is joined with Creatures, without any Mark of Distinction or Superiority; because (as I said) when God is joined with any others, there is no need of such Note or Mark.

Therefore the more learned of our Opposers, especially the Ancients of the first 400 Years, do not insist on this Text of St. *Matthew*, to prove the Divinity or Personality of the Son or Spirit: by these words, *In the Name of the Father, Son and Spirit*, they understand only, *to the Profession*, and *to the Obedience* of the Father, Son and Spirit. According to these Criticks, the Sense of the objected Text is only this: Baptize the Nations into the Profession and Obedience of the Father, or God, and of Jesus Christ, whom the Father hath commanded us to *hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto us*; and of the other Teacher, even the Spirit or Inspiration of God, by which he advises and comforts the Faithful in all *extraordinary* Exigences. Our Author may please to consult Mr. *Pool*'s Collections on this Text, where he will see divers such Interpretations as this, all of them by the Criticks of his own Party, and all of them consistent with *the Unity of God*, as 'tis held by the Socinians. Therefore all those Interpreters and Criticks must be understood as giving up to us this Text.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

On the first Verses of St. John's Gospel.

OUR Author's next Effort, is from that well-known Context, even the first Verses of St. *John's* Gospel. The Clauses by him urged, are these; *In the Beginning was the WORD; and the WORD was with God, and the WORD was God. All things were made by Him*, namely by the WORD; *and without Him was not any thing made, that was made.——He was in the World, and the World was made by him, and the World knew him not.* Others have added to these; *And the WORD was made Flesh, and dwelt among us.* Also that Testimony of the Baptist, *He that cometh after me, is preferred before me, for he was before me.*

Our Author endeavours to Ridicule the common Socinian Interpretation of these Verses, by Misrepresenting it; and by concealing the remarkable and probable Proofs, which the Socinians add to every Clause of their Interpretation.

He recites also the Explication of this Context by Dr. *Hammond*; which, he saith, is a full Explication, and the Sense of the Catholic Church. Indeed Dr. *Hammond* has given us the Belief of the Catholic Church, so called; and has set it down as the Sense of this Context of St. *John*: but that's the very thing in question, whether that *Belief* be the Sense of these Verses.

Our present Opposer has performed so Meanly, in the long Discourse he has made on this Proem of St. *John's* Gospel, that I am not willing to be seen, maintaining a Scuffle with him. Others of his Party have known, how to make a vigorous Opposition, from this Context; the sum of what they say, is.

Every Clause here objected, is a several Argument against the Socinian Heresy: The First declares the Real *Divinity* of our Saviour, by asserting his *Eternity*; in these words, *In the Beginning* (as who should say, from the very First, or from all Eternity) *was the WORD.* The second Clause saith, The WORD was *with* God, to signify the *continual* and *perpetual* Generation of the WORD or Son; and also the *mutual Intrisitence* of these two Divine Persons in one another. The next yet more Directly, and even Expressly, contradicts the Socinians; by saying, *the WORD was God*: They say, He was a *Man*, and no more than a Man. 'Tis true, they allow He may be called God, in such sense as *Moses* is called a God, (and that by God himself) at *Exod.* 7. 1. in that He was to represent the Person of God, being to deliver God's Commands to *Pharaoh*, to *Israel*, and to the *Egyptians*: But our Evangelist has been careful to prevent these Evasions, by telling us what kind of God the WORD was; *All things* (saith he) *were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

And lest Incredulous and Obstinate Men should interpret *all things* in these words, to be only *All things belonging to the Gospel-state*; or the whole Oeconomy and Doctrine of the Gospel; as the Socinians would now wrest St. *John's* words: To prevent (I say) this Elusion, he adds yet further; *He was in the World, and the World was made by him.* But this Holy Evangelist has not yet done with them; He says, at *V.* 14. *The Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among us*: 'Twere Nonsense to speak so, of a Person who was only a Man; Who ever said, *Peter* or *James* were made Flesh, and dwelt among us? Would it not be Ridiculous so to speak? Therefore the Lord Jesus was more than a Man, He was God made *Flesh*, that is to say, *Man*; for Flesh is a very usual

Scripture-Term for Man. He was made Man, by being Incarnate in an Human Nature, by an Hypostatical Union to a Body of Flesh and a Rational Soul. This Evangelist has given us too, the Testimony of the other *John*, even *John the Baptist*, concerning the Præ-existence or Præ-eternity of our Saviour; *He that cometh after me, is preferred before me, for he was before me.* We are expressly told by St. *Luke*, that *John Baptist* was six Months older than our Lord Christ, *as Man*: Therefore when St. *John* says, Christ was before him; it must be thus understood, that as God He was before *John*, tho as Man He was younger than *John*.

It is true, the Socinians have strained their Wits, to give other Senses of these Verses; or so to interpret them, as to make their Saviour nothing but a Man; not God, not a Creatour, no not so much as an Angel, but a meer Man. Now when Expressions may have divers Senses, it sometimes happens, that there are no *Primitive Acts*, to ascertain one of the Senses above, or rather than another of them: but Providence has been watchful on behalf of the true Faith, and the Catholic Interpretation of these Verses, by preserving to us *Ancient Acts*, and such as must needs satisfy sincere and teachable Persons; the Church is in possession of most certain Records, by which she indubitably proves the Catholic Interpretation of this Context.

The Socinians are not the First Authors of this Heresy, that there is but one Divine Person, (even the God and Father of our Lord Christ) and that the Lord Christ was nothing else but a Prophet, and the Holy Spirit only the Power and Inspiration of God. The *Nazarens*, and *Cerinthus*, and *Ebion*, immediately after the Death of the Apostles, began to propagate this Heresy, to the great Offence and Scandal of the Churches: And it so hapned, that many hearkened to them; insomuch that the Bishops and Churches of *Asia* importuned St. *John*, to write somewhat more expresly concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, than had been yet done by any of the Apostles.

St. *John* was at length prevailed on, to do as they desired; only he requested, that a General Fast might be held, to invoke the Aid of God on his Undertaking. The Fast being ended, the Holy Ghost fell upon him; and He began his Gospel *with these words, which came to him from Heaven; In the Beginning was the WORD, and the Word was with God, and the WORD was God; All things were made by Him, and without Him was not any thing made, that was made.* This Relation is made by St. *Jerom*, *Proem. Com. in Matth.* And he declares in the same place, that this was no uncertain Rumour, nor a thing of Hear-say; *Sed ita narrat Ecclesiastica Historia, The Church-History so tells us.*

The Socinians therefore swear to no purpose, in devising Comments or *Elusions* on this Context, which was designedly written against them: 'tis in vain for them to oppose their own Inventions to Primitive Acts, which tell us plainly; that this Gospel was written on purpose against their Heresy; nay, that the words of it, with which we pretend to confute them, *came down from Heaven*, or were spoken against them from Heaven; St. *John* being only the Penman, not the Author of them.

Thus it is, Sir, that the Socinians are Baffled, by *false* and *Senseless* Translations, supported by Fictions and *Legends*. There never was a Greater *Blanm*, than this Tale of St. *Jerom* out of an Ecclesiastical History, never seen by any body but Himself. *Irineus*, two Hundred Years older than St. *Jerom*, and therefore so much nearer to matter of Fact, could say nothing of St. *John's* Gospel; but this: *He published it at* Ephesus, *in* Asia, *Adverss. Haeres. Lib.* 3. c. 1. *Origen*, who had made so diligent a search among all the Monuments of Antiquity, that He might be able to give an exact Account of the Writers of Holy Scriptures; says, "Concerning the four Evangelists, we "have received by Tradition, as follows. "St. *Matthew*, first a Publican, afterwards "an Apostle, wrote his Gospel in Hebrew;

"for

" for the sake of the Jews who believed. " St. *Mark* wrote his Gospel, as St. *Peter* " declared it to him. The third is the " Gospel of *Luke*, approved by St. *Paul*; " and written for the sake of the Heathens. " *Lastly*, St. *John's Gospel*. Had St. *Jerom* seen an Ecclesiastical History that *Origen* never saw: or would *Origen* have omitted such a Famous Occasion, and Confirmation of St. *John's* Gospel, when he tells us the Occasions, and Approvers of the other Gospels? The words of *Origen*, before quoted, were extant in his Fourth Book of *Comments on St. Matthew*; they are preserved by *Eusebius*. Hist. Lib. 6. c. 25. *Eusebius* spends a whole Chapter, concerning the Order of the Evangelists; and declares the *true* Occasion and Cause of St. *John's* Writing: which, according to him, was this. It being, saith he, observed; that the other Evangelists had wrote only that part of the *Actions* and *Sayings* of our Saviour, which he *did* and *spoke* after the Imprisonment of *John the Baptist*. To supply this Defect, St. *John* was desired to commit to writing, what he remembred of our Saviour, before the *Baptist* was imprison'd. In a word, he wrote his Gospel, *to supply the Omissions of the other Three Evangelists*. Euseb. Lib. 3. c. 24. *Eusebius* had read *Hegesippus*, and whatever Church-History St. *Jerom* could have read; and he has made it his Business, to make Extracts out of all ancient Books, concerning the Writers and Writings of the New Testament: the diligence and exactness of this Historian, is much admired and praised by all Learned Men; nor will any *such* believe, that St. *Jerom* had seen an Ecclesiastical History, which *Eusebius* had not seen. St. *Jerom* says, St. *John* wrote to oppose the Unitarian Heresy; and that the first words of his Gospel, were pronounced to him from Heaven. *Eusebius* says, *John* had written his Gospel, because the other Evangelists had omitted the *Gests* and *Sayings* of our Saviour, that were before the Imprisonment of the *Baptist*. St. *Jerom* refers, for what he says, to an Ecclesiastical History, unknown to all the Ancients but himself. *Eusebius* proves the Account he gives, by solid and convincing Arguments. His words, in the Chapter before quoted, are these. " It " is evident, that the other three Evange- " lists have committed to writing, only the " Gests of our Saviour during one Year's " space; namely, after *John the Baptist's* be- " ing shut in Prison. *Matthew* sets forth " the time of his writing, in these words; " *When Jesus had heard that* John *was put in* " *Prison, He came into* Galilee. In like man- " ner, *Mark* saith; *Now after that* John *was* " *put in Prison, Jesus came into* Galilee. " *Luke* also maketh this Remark; Herod " *adding this to all the Evils he had done, shut* " *up* John *in Prison*. Therefore they say, " that the Apostle *John*, being for this " Cause thereto requested, has declared in " a Gospel according to him, the time that " was passed over in silence by the other " Evangelists, and what was done by our " Saviour therein. This is a *probable* Account; that of St. *Jerom* is *Miraculous*, and therefore pleases them who are taken with Marvellous things.

What shall we say then, that St. *Jerom dreamed*, or that he *dreamt* of an Ecclesiastical History; which was never seen before nor since: neither of them; for I doubt not, that his Tale is nothing else but an *Improvement*, and a stretch of some words of *Clemens Alexandr*, which he found recorded in the Ecclesiastical History of *Eusebius*, Lib. 6. c. 14. The words were taken by *Eusebius*, out of *the Institutions* of *Clemens Alexandr*, which *Institutions* are now lost: but *Photius* (Cod. 105, and 111.) has left us this Character of them; that they contained very many ἀσεβεῖς καὶ μυθώδεις λόγους, *Fabulous and Impious Tales*. Of these Tales, this is one; " *John*, the last of the " Evangelists, seeing that what appertain'd " to Christ's Humanity, was manifested in " the other Gospels; being thereto moved " by his Acquaintance, and inspired by the " Spirit, wrote a Gospel concerning Christ's " Divinity.

But

But to return to our Opposers; They commonly say, St. *John* wrote his Gospel against *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, and the Heresy of the Unitarians: We have seen, they have no solid ground for this Pretence, in the History of the Church; *Irenæus* and *Origin* (the most Learned of the Ancients) knew nothing of it; and *Eusebius* gives a contrary Account. But the Gospel it self, written by St. *John*, will best decide this Question: if he has more confirmed this (pretended) Heresy, than any other Writer of Holy Scripture; He did not, without doubt, write his Gospel against it. Therefore let us (briefly) see, what the Unitarian Doctrine is; and how St. *John* hath delivered his Mind concerning it.

We say; that *only the Father is true God*, that the Lord Christ is his Prophet and Messenger to Man; that therefore *what the Lord Christ said, was not from himself*, or by his own Authority, but by particular Command and Charge from God; that all the Miracles he did, were *not properly done by him*, but by the Spirit or Power of the Father given to him, as to former Prophets. Let us hear, how St. *John* in his Gospel, written designedly against us, confutes this impious Heresy: John 17. 1, 2, 3. *Father, ——this is Life Eternal, to know thee* [*the only true God*] *and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*: Or *Jesus Christ thy Messenger*. John 7. 16. *My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me*. John 12. 49. *The Father which sent me, He gave me a Commandment what I should say*. John 14. 31. *As the Father gave me Commandment, so do I*. John 5. 30. *I can do nothing of my self*. John 14. 10 *The Father that dwelleth in me*, (by his Spirit, Energy or Power) *He doth the Works*.

I know not what could be said more effectually, to evince, that the Lord Christ is not God, but the Ambassador only, and Messenger of God; *speaking*, according to the Instructions and Charge given to him; and *Acting* by a Power (not of his own, but) bestowed on him, as on former Prophets and Messengers of God. If the Texts before cited were not the very words of Scripture; were they found in any other Book, they should be Anathematiz'd as most Gross Socinianism, as the very Heresy of *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, against whom (as saith St. *Jerom's* Ecclesiastical History) they were written.

And what wretched Subterfuges do our Opposers make use of, to decline these plain Testimonies, that were *suggested by the Holy Ghost against them*: for we dare not, like them, feign Ecclesiastical Histories, which say, they were spoken against them from Heaven. First, They tell us; St. *John* doth not say, that *only the Father is God*, but *the Father is the only true God*. They say, the Socinians have not had the *Wit*, to perceive the *vast* difference between those two Expressions: It may be true, they say, and is true, that *the Father is the only true God*, as St. *John* in the alledged Text says; and yet the Son too is true God, nay the only true God; and the like of the Holy Ghost.

And when *John* says; neither the *Doctrine* nor the *Actions* of our Saviour were his own; but the Commandments of the Father given to him, and the Works of the Father dwelling in him: By *the Father* in those Texts, they say, we are to understand Three Persons, *the Father*, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Nay, when our Saviour saith; *Of that Day and Hour* (the Excision of *Jerusalem*, and the Dissolution of the Jewish Polity) *none knoweth*; *not the Angels, neither the Son, but the Father only*: 'Tis not true for all that, that the Father only (or only the Father) knoweth that Day and Hour, for then only the Father were true God; but *the Father only* in those words, is not the Father only, but also *the Son*, (who is there expressly denied to know that Day and Hour) and besides him *the Holy Ghost*.

Well, but however these things are, St. *John* has paid us off (they say) in his Proem, or first Verses of his Gospel, in those words which came to him from Heaven.

But

But if the Heavenly Words were but honestly translated, the Socinians would not fear any Inference that would be drawn from them. Our Protestant Opposers value themselves very much on this account, that they have given to the People the holy Bible in the Vulgar Languages: it may however be said, that they have only been more crafty than the Papists in imposing upon the People. The Papists have sillily raised against themselves a Clamour for with-holding the Bible from the People, and keeping it lock'd up in only the Learned Languages; and in those Countries where they have been constrained to translate the Bible, they have been so jealous, as to forbid the Commonalty of their Communion the use of their own Translations. The Protestants have been wiser, tho not a whit more sincere; for they have made Translations of the Bible into all Languages, and so far have they been from forbidding the use of them, that they incourage it with all their Might, well knowing the Benefit that must arise to themselves thereby; for they know they have printed all the Bibles that are in the Original Greek Tongue, from only such Manuscript Copies, as *have been corrected* to speak the Language of the Church; and from Bibles so corrected and printed, they have made their Translations: nor has the Fraud stopp'd here, for wheresoever there is an Ambiguity in the Original Hebrew or Greek, they have always so translated, as to confirm their own Doctrines. This was the right method to establish their Opinions, not that unjudicious impolitick course taken by the Papists, which begets suspicion of them, and has therefore been a great means of their Overthrow: there has been nothing so plausibly and effectually urged against them, as this, that they have been afraid to let the People have the Word of God, and that their Opposers desire and endeavour nothing more. But if those who boast so much of this Service done by them to the People, had meant as well, or if they would be owned for Persons that have bestowed the Word of God on their Flocks, they should have put into the Margin of their Translations, those *other Translations* of which (they know) the Original Greek and Hebrew Text is capable, and with those Translations, the *other Readings* in the Manuscript Copies. This had been plain dealing: but you must excuse them, 'twould have have hazarded those Remains of Popery, (and which indeed are the principal parts of Popery) that they thought fit still to retain: those *other Readings* of the Manuscript Copies, and the *other Translations* of famous Criticks, would have enabled even the common People to perfect *the Reformation* beyond the Standard intended by these Translators. The People would have been questioning the Doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, Original Sin, the Servitude of our Wills to *Evil* only, and other such like Doctrines, against which they cannot now so much as once open. The Translators were aware, that such a Translation and Edition of our Bibles would have made all Men Divines; because to understand, and to be able to judg, is not peculiar to Men that know Greek or Latin, but is common and natural to all Mankind, and to every Man, tho he understands but one Language. But 'tis time to give the sense of this so much controverted Beginning of St. *John*'s Gospel; I must crave leave however to premise this one thing.

'Tis a Rule of Criticism approved, and urged also by the Learnedest of our Opposers; that the Writers of the New Testament have a particular regard to the Notions and Opinions of the Jewish Church; as also to the Customs, and Forms of Speech in use among that People; so that such as happen to be altogether ignorant, either of the Doctrines current among the Jews, or of their Customs and Forms of speaking; such will sometimes widely mistake in interpreting the New Testament. To instance in only such Opinions and Forms of Speech as were frequent among them concerning

cerning the Messias, or Christ; 'tis certain, they called him *the WORD*; this is seen in divers places of their Chaldee Paraphrases, which they used to read in their Synagogues; and in very many places of *Philo-Judæus*, who was contemporary to the Apostles. They said also of the Messias who was to come, that *the World was made for him*; meaning thereby, that the World was at first made by God, with intention to subject it, in the fulness of time, to the Messias and his Law: See *Grotius* on *Heb.* 1. 2. and on *Heb.* 1. 10, 11, 12. They added, as the same *Grotius* there observes, that the Messias should make a new and a better World. In what sense they meant this, and how they proved it, I have shewn before at *Chap.* 3. where I give an account of *Heb.* 1. 10, 11. Moreover, they used the words *El* and *Elohim* (which the Greeks render by Θεὸς, the English by the word *God*) of Angels, Kings and Magistrates, and of all such as are extraordinary Messengers and Ministers of God: I need not to prove this, our Opposers confess it, and 'tis an Observation made by our Saviour himself, at *John* 10. 35. These Keys will let us into the sense of the Verses about which we are contending, without multiplying *Divine Persons*, or Gods, as the Trinitarians do, or *Creators*, as is here done by the Arians.

In the beginning. That is, say our Opposers, *From the very first*, from for ever, or from all Eternity. But when *Moses* says, *In the beginning* God created the Heavens and the Earth, does he mean *from for ever*, from the very first, or from Eternity? Why do they not perceive, that both *Moses* and St. *John* must be understood, as referring (in those words, *In the beginning*) to the Subjects of which they are writing: *John*'s Subject is the Gospel-state and Oeconomy; the Subject of *Moses* is the Creation and the first Ages of Mankind; therefore *Moses* means only, in the beginning *of the World*; *John* means, in the beginning *of the Gospel-state*.

In the beginning *was the WORD.* He intends here to say, In the beginning *was the Messias*, or Christ, whom the Jews, and from them *we* also have used to call *the WORD*.

'Tis not so easy to determine, with Certainty, why the Jews called the Messias, whom they expected, the *WORD*; but 'tis evident why St. *John* has been willing to comply with them, in giving that Name to the Messias: for as at *vv.* 7, 8, & 9. he calls our Saviour *the Light*, because he was the Bringer of the Gospel-light; so for the same reason he is content also to call him the *WORD*, because he was the Messenger of Glad-Tidings, the Bringer of the Gospel-Word, or of that new Revelation of the Divine Will, which is indifferently to be called the Gospel, or the Word of God.

This reason of the Name *the WORD*, given to our Saviour, is observed by *Origen*, and after him by St. *Chrysostom*, and is approved by *Maldonat*, *Beza*, *Gomarus*, Dr. *Hammond*, and other principal Interpreters among our Opposers.

The WORD was with God, and the WORD was God. Our Opposers themselves will not deny, because every Novice in Grammar knows it, that the original words should have been thus rendred, The WORD was with *the* God, and the WORD was *a* God. We claim this Translation as absolutely necessary for clearing the meaning of the Evangelist in this place. He saith not, the Word was *with God*, but with *the* God; because ὁ Θεὸς (or *the* God) is always used to signify the true God, or him who is God *by way of Excellence and Appropriation*, as Grammarians speak: but Θεὸς *a* God, is in Holy Scripture applied to Angels, to Kings, to Prophets, and to all such as any way represent the Person of him who is indeed God. Thus *Moses* is called and named *a* God, and that by God himself, *Exod.* 7. 1. because he was to represent the Person, and bring the Commands or Word of God to *Pharaoh*, and to the People of *Israel* and *Egypt*. *Moses* being called (by Confession of our Opposers) *a* God, on the

the fore-mentioned account; we ought not to be surprized, that this Evangelist has called *the WORD*, or Messias, *a* God, seeing he had the very same reason to call him so, that there was for *Moses* his being so called; for the Messias was no less than *Moses*, the Ambassador and Representative of God, and that also not to one or two Nations, but to all Mankind.

But whereas he is here said to be (or have been) with *the* God; the meaning is, that before he entred on his Office, he was taken up into Heaven, to be fully instructed and informed in the nature and quality of his Office, and of that whole Charge which he was to deliver to Men. 'Tis in vain here, that our present Opposer Mr. *Milb*, demands, after a scoffing manner, at what time *this* Assumption into Heaven did happen; 'tis enough that we are told the thing by this Evangelist, and by our Saviour; we are not obliged to guess at the time, which the Scriptures have thought fit to conceal. The thing itself is plainly enough intimated in divers Texts of this Evangelist, *John* 3. 13. *No Man hath ascended into Heaven, but he that is come down from Heaven; even the Son of Man, who WAS in Heaven.* So that Text is translated by *Beza*, *Erasmus*, *Camerarius*, and other Criticks. *John* 6. 62. *What if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?* John 8. 38. *I speak that which I have seen with my Father.* See also *John* 6. 38, 51. It is true, the Evangelists have not recorded the particular Time or History of our Saviour's *first* Assumption unto God, as they have of his Transfiguration, his second Assumption, and other remarkable Passages of his Life: but the reason of that is, because they were Eye-witnesses of the *latter*, but the *other* happened before they were called to be Disciples, or to attend on him; and he himself never (as it should seem) told them of it, but only hinted it in some Discourses and Defences which he made to his Opposers. You see, Sir, there is no need of a *Chimerical* and imaginary, *perpetual and continual Generation of the Son*, nor yet of an impossible *mutual In-being* of the Father and Son, for our understanding these words, *the WORD was with God*: the Difficulty is solved, after a *natural and intelligible* way; for the WORD was indeed *with* God, because he was taken up into Heaven, to be informed of all things appertaining to *the Gospel-Dispensation*; as *Moses* was called up into the Mountain, to be instructed in the Particulars of *the Legal Dispensation*; and as St. *Paul* was caught up into the third Heaven, to have Revelations and Visions necessary for the Apostle of the Gentiles.

Our Opposers do not find what to object to this Explication of the words, *the WORD was with God*; but to the other Interpretation, that the WORD was called *a* God, in the same sense only (or chiefly) that *Moses* was so called at *Exod.* 7. 1. they reply, this Evasion of the Socinians is set aside by the Description which St. *John* here adds, for he describes the WORD to be God, or *a* God, not as *Moses* was, by Representation and Mission, but because *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made; and because the World was made by him.*

This was a bold Translation, they should at least have signified in the Margin, that the words might have been rendred; *For him were all things made, and without respect to him there was nothing made that was made; the World was made for him.* They know very well, I make Challenge to them to deny it, that the Greek Preposition which they have rendred *by*, might have been rendred *for*; so as to make the sense before-said even this, *For* him were all things made, the World was made *for* him. There is no Greek Lexicon but owns this Signification of that Preposition, when 'tis put (as here) before a Genitive.

'Tis enough to determine us which of the aforesaid Translations we ought to follow; that we know 'twas the Belief of the Jews, and is a most certain and undeniable Truth, that *all things were made for the Messias*;

 that

that is, were at first made with intention to subject them in the fulness of Time, to the Messias and his Law, *both which God intended* before he actually made the World. But we have besides for it this irrefragable Argument; that 'tis certain, there is but one Creator, and the one Creator is no other but God: seeing therefore the WORD is here distinguished from *the* God, (and thereby denied to be *the* God) we are obliged to translate here, All things were made *for* him, the World was made *for* him; not the World was made *by* him, or all things *by* him.

I say, we are obliged thus to translate, or this Translation is *necessary*, on supposition that St. *John* speaks here of the *old* or first Creation, and the *visible* or material World. But the Socinians have hitherto supposed, that he speaks here of the *new* Creation and the *Spiritual* World; even that great Change of Affairs in the World, which hath been so considerable, that the Scriptures have divers times called it *the New Heavens and the New Earth*, as has been shown on *Heb.* 1.10.11. If these are the *All things*, and this *the World* intended by St. *John*; we admit the Translation of our Opposers, that All things were made *by* the WORD; for 'twas by his Ministry, that great Change of Affairs, called by the Jews, *the World of the Messias*, was effected. If to this Interpretation, it be objected, that 'tis not very likely, that this Evangelist would lay such an occasion of Error in our way, as to say, all things were made *by* the WORD, and the World was made *by* him, if the WORD were not indeed the Maker of the World: because very few would apprehend that he spoke of a new Creation; and I know not what *World of the Messias*. I confess the Objection is weighty, but it may be (reasonably) answered, that the *New* Creation, the *Spiritual* World, and the World of the Messias, was so universally known to the Jews, and also to the Christians of those Times, who were all converted by Jewish Preachers, that St. *John* reasonably expected to be readily understood by them. Especially considering, that but one God, and one only Creator, was then so well known to be the Doctrine of Christianity and of Judaism; that no one, who was at all acquainted with those Religions, would understand a Writer of either of those Persuasions, of any other Creation or World, but the World of the Messias and the new Creation, when he attributed a Creation or World to any Person but God. In a word, St. *John* supposed, that he spoke safely and intelligibly, because writing his Gospel for the use of Jews and Christians, who knew the Doctrines of the Jewish Church concerning the Messias; such must needs perfectly understand of what World he spake, when he should say, *the World was made by the WORD*.

The short is, either St. *John* speaks here of the *old* Creation, and the *visible* World, and then we ought to render his words, All things were made *for* him, the World was made *for* him; which is an Allusion to a known saying of the Jews, that *the World was made for the Messias*, namely, to subject it (in the fulness of Time) to the Messias and his Law, as great and certain Truth: Or, he speaks of the *new* Creation, and the World which all Men expected the Messias should make; and if so, we understand him as saying, All things were made *by* him, and the World was made *by* him.

The rest is easy; *The WORD was made Flesh, and dwelt among us.* And, *He that cometh after me, is preferred before me, for he was before me.*

It will not be denied, Sir, by any of our Opposers, that instead of *The Word was made Flesh*, (that is, say they, was made *Man*) we may render the Greek by *the Word WAS Flesh*, that is to say, *was Man*, or *a Man*. The Greek Word which, 'tis serve the present turn, they render here by *was made*, is by themselves in this very Chapter rendered *WAS*, Ver. 6. *There WAS a Man sent from God, whose Name was* John.

'Tis

"is plain enough; why our Opposers would take no notice, that St. *John's* words might be rendred *the Word was Flesh*; or, *was a Man, and dwelt among us*: for this Translation would have turned the whole Concert against them. It would have been perceived by All, that when the Word is before called a God, the meaning must be, he is a God as he represented the true God; and because (like *Moses*, who on the same Account is called a God, at *Exod.* 7. 1.) he is the Ambassador and Messenger of God, the bringer of the Commands and Word of God. Men would have discerned too, that they must not interpret *St. John*, as saying that the World (the visible World) and All things were made *by* the WORD, but only *for* the WORD: Nay, this Translation, *the WORD was a Man*, would have contradicted them Directly and Expressly; for though they say Jesus Christ was a Man, yet *the WORD* (to which He was personally united) was *God*, and not Man, according to *them*.

But *John Baptist* has testified of *the WORD*; He is preferred before me, for *He was Prior to me*. Here again the Translators have favoured themselves, by rendring the Greek words *WAS before me*; they might have been rendred, *IS before me*: But allowing their Translation, *Was before me*, *Erasmus*, *Grotius*, *Beza*, *Maldonat*, and other Critics observe, that the words are to be understood, of *a Priority of Dignity*, not a priority of *Time*; so as to make this Sense, He is preferred before me, tho in regard of Time I am before Him, because He was indeed before me in Excellence of Merit, and Dignity of Person and Office.

It is a very common thing with our Opposers, to pretend, that the Socinians cannot paraphrase this beginning of *St. John's* Gospel, without making such an *harsh* Sense, as is next to ridiculous; therefore let us put all that has been said, into one view, in this following Paraphrase; and do you, Sir, and all Men judge, whether it be Harsh *or* Incoherent. "*In the beginning* of the Gospel-"Scene, was the Messiah, whom the Jews "have used to call *the WORD*: and we also "may so call him, because He is the Great "Messenger and Preacher of the Gospel-"Word. This WORD was assumed into "Heaven, and was there *with God*; to be "instructed in all that he was to *say* and *do*, "in the execution of the Office of the "Messiah. He was with *the* God; and He "himself was *a* God, being to represent "the Person of God as his Ambassador, "and to deliver his Commands and "Word to Men: On which account very "Many, and particularly *Moses*, are called "Gods in Holy Scripture. The Messias "was decreed before the World was; nay, "the World was at first made, with intention "to subject it, in the fulness of Time, "to the Messias and his Law: So that the "*World*, *and all things* may be said, to have "been made *for* him; and that *without regard had to him, nothing was made that was made*. Yet as Great a Person as "the Messias is, this is always to be remembered, that *He was Flesh*, or Man, Mans "like to us, and that dwelt among us.

"I will say no more of him, at this time, "but this; that *John the Baptist*, whom all "Men took to be a Prophet, bore this Te-"stimony of him: That tho the WORD "came after him, in respect of Time; yet "the WORD *was indeed before him*, in the "Excellence of his Person, the Dignity "of his Office, and the Miraculous Power "over Diseases and Devils, bestowed on "him.

What is there, Sir, in all this Paraphrase, that is not intelligible and easy? And for its Agreement with the Greek Text of *St. John*, we prove it by Rules of Criticism, not only not deniable by our Opposers, but advanced and urged by themselves.

It all depends upon these two Observations. *First*, Sometimes such as are meer Men, are, on the account of their Deputation and Mission from God, honoured with the Name of God: which we prove by the Example of *Moses*, (the Lawgiver of the Old Testa-

ment,

ment, as the Lord Christ is of the New) and from the Mouth of our Saviour himself, at *Joh.* 10. 35. *Secondly*, That the Preposition ὁτι, and the Verb ἐγένετο, may be rendred by the English words *For* and *Was*: which we show by all the Greek Lexicons, and by their own Translations of other Texts of Scripture.

Our Opposers alledg this Context, as the principal Evidence they have to produce, that there is more than one Divine Person, and more than one who is Creator of the World: We answer, we are taught in the *First* and *Fourth* Commandments, that there is *but one who is God*, and *but one Maker* of the Visible and Material World; and therefore this Context ought to be interpreted, in consistence with those two Great Commandments spoken by God himself. Sure it must be evident hereupon, that they ought not to relie on a *dubious* Context, against two such Proofs as are those two Commandments. When Points of Faith are turned into Commandments or Laws, it argues the great Importance of those Articles of our Faith: And it must needs be very *dangerous* to advance a contrary Faith, and very *foolish* to advance a contrary Faith on the Credit of a Context, which at best is of doubtful and uncertain Construction; of so doubtful Construction, that if it may be Translated and Interpreted, in favour of their Opinion, yet it may be also so Rendred and Interpreted, as *Flatly* to contradict it, and *Perfectly* destroy and overthrow it.

You will perhaps say, Sir; but in this Dispute concerning the Truth of Translations, What can an Unlearned Man do; which side can he take? or rather, How can he take any Side at all; being not able to judg between the contending Parties? ought he not in prudence, wholly to suspend his Judgment?

I answer; He must consult his *Reason*, concerning the thing in Question. If he consults his own *Reason*, he will find an absolute Impossibility in the Trinitarian Doctrine; his Reason will assure him, that an Almighty Father, and an Almighty Son, are most certainly Two Gods; and that *two* Creators can be no other but two Gods: therefore he may, and he must, infer; that the Explication of this Context of St. *John*, which advances such a Doctrine, is certainly false, and such a Mistake as subverts Christianity. God forbid, that our Faith should depend, on the Quarrels and Debates of Learned Men; or on an uncertain Criticism; or on the *contrary Traditions* of contending Parties: No no, Faith has a certain Rule, even *Holy Scripture interpreted in consistance with evident Reason*; this is the Infallible Rule, and of this the Unlearned are as competent Judges, as he that has all the Learning in the World. That cannot be true, which is contrary to clear Reason; for *Clear Reason is nothing else but clear Truth*: Therefore if the Unitarians have made it appear, that the Doctrines which they oppose, are Manifest Contradictions to Reason; an Unlearned Man is as sure as the most Learned, that such Doctrines are not the meaning of Holy Scripture, or of any Context therein.

Our Opposers tell the People, they are not to believe the Transubstantiation, tho grounded on those express Words of Scripture, *This is my Body*; because that Doctrine implies several Contradictions to clear Reason: Why do they not keep to this Rule, to which they would oblige their People? Why do they not renounce the Errors of the Trinity and Incarnation, which imply so many more Contradictions to Reason, than can be pretended of the Transubstantiation? While they argue against the Common Enemy the Papists, about Transubstantiation; or against the *Lutherans*, about Consubstantion; Reason is all in all with them, and you can get nothing out of them, but *Reason* and the judgment of *Sense*: But when the Dispute is with the *Socinians*, the Tables are turned; then you hear nothing from them, but the necessity of submitting *Reason* to Revelation; then they give us their Catalogues of things, which (they say) are contradictory to our Reason, and yet must be believed. Thus while they Argue against the

the Papists, 'tis *on Socinian Principles*, that the Scripture must be interpreted in consistence with Evident *Reason*; which is a yielding all the Controverted Points to the Socinians: But when they think fit to fall foul on the Socinians, 'tis *on Popish Principles*, that the Scripture must be interpreted by the Determinations and Decisions of Holy Mother-Church, as she is represented in General Councils, which are directed by the Holy Ghost: Which implies the yielding Transubstantiation, and many other Points, to the Papists, who can show for them Councils as truly General, as any that can be alledged for the Trinity or Incarnation.

In fine, such of our Opposers as are *Protestants*, must either come over *to Us*, or revolt to *Rome*: If they will not be obliged to interpret Scripture by Reason, they are obliged to turn Papists; for the Decisions of the Church in Councils, and *the mere Letter of Scripture*, are against them: but if they admit no Interpretation of Scripture, but what is consistent with Reason, both They and the Papists must be Unitarians, because the Trinity and the Incarnation are contrary *to*, and inconsistent *with* Reason, much more than the Transubstantiation is.

CHAP. VI.

On the other Texts of St. John.

NEXT, He takes notice of some words of our Saviour, at *John* 10. 30, 36, 38. *I and my Father are one.——I am the Son of God.——The Father is in me, and I in him.* He saith; the Jews, from those words, *I and my Father are one*, did infer after this manner; *Thou being a Man, makest thy self God.* He adds; if the Jews mistook in the Inference they made, from those words; nothing can excuse, either our Saviour or his Apostles, from extream Unkindness; since they would take no pains to rectify a Mistake, which in all appearance was Involuntary.

A little more Deference would have become our Author, in making a Judgment, concerning what our Saviour or his Apostles ought to have done, towards rectifying the Mistakes of the Jews: And I think too, he needed not to be so concerned, on behalf of the poor Innocent Lambs the Jews; who only mistook (true Hearts,) and did not designedly pervert the words of our Saviour. On the contrary, I take it to be certain; that the Mistake of the Jews, was not Involuntary, but Affected and Malicious; and however that be, yet our Saviour hath said enough, both in that Context and elsewhere, to rectify the Mistakes of any whomsoever, concerning his words, *I and the Father are one; I am the Son of God; the Father is in me, and I in him.*

Our Opposers ordinarily object to us; that the Jews understood those Expressions of our Saviour, as themselves do: namely, as signifying, that he professed himself to be God. But the Jews put a malicious Construction on our Saviour's words; that they might expose him to *Hatred* and *Persecution*. To be satisfied of this, we need only to consider, that they came to him, with design to ensnare him in his words; as they had done oft-times before, and did many times afterwards. Let us hear what they say, v. 24. Then came the Jews round about him, and said to him; *How long dost thou make us to doubt? if thou be the Christ, tell us plainly.* To comprehend the true meaning of their putting this Question, we must look back to the foregoing Chapter, where, at *V.* 22. we

we are told, *The Jews had agreed already, that if any Man should confess, that He* (Jesus) *was the Christ, He should be put out of the Synagogue*; i. e. He should be Excommunicated. We may add to this Observation; that by the Constitutions of that Church, every Person professing himself to be a Prophet, and not being really so, was to be put to death; much more if he pretended to be the Great Prophet of all, the Messiah or Christ. I say now, seeing they so perfectly persuaded themselves, that Jesus was not the *Christ*; that they resolved to Excommunicate any of their own Number, who should acknowledg him for the *Christ*; 'tis evident enough, that their Question, *Art thou the Christ?* was *insidious*, and designed only to get something from his own Mouth, on which they might Excommunicate him; nay, and proceed against him as a false Pretender, to be a *Prophet* and *Christ*. Can any one wonder, or reasonably doubt, that such Persons put a malicious Interpretation, on the words of his answer to them? And is it for Christians, to draw Arguments, nay, *build Articles of Faith* on the sense that such Persons made of our Saviour's words? and yet this is the great Argument of our Opposers, from this Context; The Jews, say they, understood our Saviour in saying, that He was God. Why do They not take notice, that the Jews assembled about him for no other Purpose, but to find Occasion against him, either by his own express Words, or by the Construction they could make of his Words?

But they say farther; our Saviour did not rectify the Mistake of the Jews. I know not, how it would help the Cause of our Opposers; if indeed it were so; that our Saviour had left the Jews in the hands of their own Malice, without caring to answer their groundless Cavils; provided He hath been careful, clearly to explain his Meaning to his Disciples, or others who in time to come might (happily) mistake him. But the Truth is, He doth in this very Context deny the Calumny of the Jews, that He made himself (so 'tis in the Original) a God. For He answers them at *Vers.* 36. *Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World; Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?* The Unitarians may argue as *strongly*, from this Answer of our Saviour, as their Opposers have argued *weakly*, from the malicious Construction that his Adversaries made of this former words, *I and my Father are one*. 'Tis a *weak* Argument, to say, The Lord Christ is true God, for his inveterate Adversaries (who sought his Life) charged him with making himself a God: But we reason *Unanswerably*, when we say, the Lord Christ is the Messenger whom God has sent into the World, and not God himself; because He replies to the Jews, that God sanctified him indeed, and sent him into the World; and that He had never said of himself any higher thing, than this which is true of every good Man, *I am the Son of God*.

I will not now enter into a particular Discussion, what is the very Meaning of that *whole* Defence, which our Saviour there makes of himself in this Context; I conceive, that neither the Trinitarians nor Unitarians have hitherto comprehended all that our Saviour intended to say: But 'tis not necessary to inquire into a Matter, that will require a very long Discourse to clear it; because elsewhere our Saviour has interpreted all the Expressions, to which the Jews excepted, and at which others have so dangerously stumbled. They are these Three, *I and my Father are one; I am the Son of God; the Father is in me, and I in him.*

I and my Father are one. He saith as much of his Disciples; and explains to us, what we are to understand by the words, *Joh.* 17. 22. *The Glory which thou gavest me*, (i. e. the Glory, or Honour of being the Ambassador of God to Men) *I have given to them*, (to my Disciples) *that they may be One, as we are One.* Here our Lord declares to us, these Three Points; that He is One with the Father; that He hath made his Disciples also, to be One with the Father, and with himself; and in what regard it is, that He and

They

They are one with the Father; not by an *Oneness*, or Unity of Person, as the Sabellians held; nor by an Oneness of Nature or Godhead, as the Trinitarians hold; but by such an Unity or Oneness as is between the *Sender* and the *Sent*, the *Ambassador* and his *Principal*; namely, an Oneness of *Design* and *Intention*. For the sense of our Saviour there is plainly this; As thou hast made me to be one with thy self, even a Partner and Sharer in the same Design, the Design of reconciling Men to God; so have I made my Disciples to be one with us both, and with one another, by substituting them in my Place, and by employing and engaging them in the same Design. Again, he saith at Ver. 11. *Keep those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are.* As who should say, As thou Father and I are one by our *Mutual Love*, so keep Those whom thou hast given me, in a like Unity, both with Us and among Themselves.

Thus it is plain, that our Saviour is one with the Father (that is, with God) by an Oneness of Affection and Love, and by an Oneness of Design and Intention: and he teaches us at the same time, that there is the same Unity or Oneness, not only between the Father and himself on the one part, and all faithful Disciples on the other part; but also among the Faithful themselves.

Our Saviour having given us these *Rational* and *Plain* Senses of his words, *I and the Father are one*, the Socinians acquiesce in them, without erecting impossible and impious Schemes, such as an Unity of mere Persons in one and the same numerical Godhead; they leave those things to such as are not contented with Scripture Expressions, or with a Faith which is Rational, Intelligible and Plain, but must have *mysteries* to amaze and confound their Understandings, as if *Faith* were nothing but Ignorance or Brutality, whereas the Apostle (on the contrary) defines or describes it to be *Reason*.

The Father is in me, and I in him. It is true, but he prays that all the Faithful may have the same Privilege, *John 17. 21, 22. I pray — that they all may be one, as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they may be one in us.* And the Criticks have observed this following *reading* in ancient Copies, as *John 6. 56. He that eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him; as the Father is in me, and I in the Father.* Why and in what sense our Saviour saith, He was in the Father, and the Father in him; and in what regard and respects, he desires and prays, that all such as believe in his Name, may be one in him and in the Father, is explained by this Evangelist, in his first Epistle, 1 *John* 3. 24. *He that keepeth his* (God's) *Commandments, dwelleth in him, and he in him.* 1 John 4. 16. *He that dwelleth in Love, dwelleth in God, and God in him.*

Our Saviour therefore, and all the Faithful, are said to be in the Father or God, by their *Obedience* and *Love*, and God is in them by his mutual Love to them. This is the Interpretation which the Scripture gives of it self; we ought not to hearkening Dreams or Fancies of *Mystical* Divines, who think nothing is Religion, but what no body understands, and what contradicts Reason and good Sense.

Last of all, our Saviour also said, *I am the Son of God.* Every one confesses that he was so, because he was generated by the Divine Power, on a Virgin, without the Concurrence of any other Father but God; yet even this as great a matter as it is, is not so great a Glory to him, as that he was the Son of God in such Sense, as all the Faithful are called God's Children, Sons and Daughters of God, begotten of God; namely, because of their Similitude and Likeness to God in Holiness or Purity, to which they have been begotten by him, by his Word and other Means suitable and adapted to their Rational Nature. *Mat. 5. 45. That ye may be the Children of your Father which is in Heaven.* 1 John 5. 18. *Whosoever is born of God, sinneth not; he that is begotten of God, keepeth himself.*

Whereas

Whereas therefore the Lord Christ is sometimes called *the only begotten* of the Father, it is to be understood, as when *Isaac* is called the *only* Son, and *the only begotten* Son of *Abraham*, at *Gen.* 22. 2, 12. *Heb.* 11. 17. *Abraham* had other Sons begotten by himself, yet *Isaac* is called his *only begotten* in regard of his Father's *particular* and *especial* Love to him, even such as Parents usually have for an only Child. And in this sense the Greek word (used concerning our Saviour) which we render *only begotten*, is frequently used in Greek Authors, and not only of such Person or Persons, as are strictly and in proper speaking *only begotten*.

In these Interpretations of the objected Clauses, *I and the Father are one*; *I am the Son of God*; *the Father is in me, and I in him*; we have the concurring Judgment of the principal Criticks and Interpreters among the Trinitarians: some of them do blame the Fathers for urging such Scripture-Expressions as these, against the Arians and Photinians; and they call the Interpretations of the Fathers, and of some Modern Writers of Controversies, *Violent Glosses*.

Our present Opposer was aware of this, and therefore is forced to say at *P.* 354. *We are not bound to regard what some Men of great Names say, or boldly assert*: It is true, but the Authority of such Men whose Names are (deservedly) great in Critical Learning, and especially in the *sacred Criticism*, doth at least evince thus much, that the Texts which *They* give up to their Opposers, ought to be placed in a Class by themselves, they ought to be reckoned among the Proofs that are brought for *show*, and Ostentation of Number, or to fill up the spare Pages of a Book, or in a popular Sermon, not in such a Book, wherein the Author professes to deal only with the Learned, and to urge no other Text but what is indeed an Argument on his behalf.

The *short* is, our Opposers litigate with us concerning the sense of these Expressions, *I and the Father are one*; *God is my Father*; *I am in the Father, and the Father in me*: We show hereupon, from express Scripture, that all these things are true of all the Faithful, and are said of them, no less than of our Saviour: We show farther, that they are interpreted in Holy Scripture, to be an *Onness* of Design and Love, an *In-being* by Obedience and Love on the part of the Lord Christ and Believers, and of Protection and Love on the part of God; and that the Lord Christ may be so the *Son of God*, and his *only Begotten*, as that still he is but a *Man*, and not *God*: We show that all this is confess'd, tho not by the *wrangling* Pulpit, and *trifling* Systematicks and Catechists; yet by the chief Interpreters and Criticks, and first Reformers, even among our Opposers themselves. On the contrary, those that interpret the before-mentioned Expressions of our Saviour, as if in them he meant to say, that he is *God*; such do advance an Interpretation that destroys the Unity of God, contradicts manifest Reason, and has no Vouchers but the *Jews*; I say, none but the Jews; for Trinitarians can produce no Text of Scripture, nor any Profane Author that can possibly be understood to mean by such Expressions what they mean, namely, *a numerical Onness by Nature, an In-being by Mixture of Persons, and a Natural Generation out of the very Essence of God*. Upon these Texts therefore we have as much advantage against them, as possibly we can have, even Reason, the Current of Scripture, the Authority of their own Criticks, and of all Profane Writers.

The next Trouble he gives us out of the New Testament, is, from *John* 20. 28. Thomas *answered, and said unto him* (unto Jesus) *My Lord, and my God*.

Socinus himself, *Wolzogenius* and *Slichtingius*, learned Unitarians, do not only grant, but they contend, that it was indeed the Intention of *Thomas*, to call our Saviour his *Lord*, and his *God*; but 'tis in no other sense than the Author of the 45th Psalm, calls *Solomon God*; *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*: To which he adds, speaking to the

the Queen concerning her Husband *Solomon*, *Hearken, O Daughter, forget thy own People, and thy Father's House: So shall the King greatly desire thy Beauty; for he is thy Lord God, and worship thou him.* So 'tis in the Version of the Psalms, in the Book of Common-Prayer; which Translation, I judge, our Author will not disclaim. And so also St. *Jerome* translates, *Ipse est Dominus Deus tuus, & adorabunt eum*: but the Translators imployed by King *James*, have left out the word *God*, from those words to the Queen, *He is the Lord thy God.* But seeing *Solomon* had before been called God, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever*; 'tis undeniable that in this Psalm he is called both *Lord* and *God*; and his Queen is bid to *worship* him, that is, to honour him; for such was the Language of the Eastern Nations to their Kings, and Persons in Eminent Dignity. The Prophets *Moses* and *Samuel* are called *Elohim*, or God, *Exod.* 7. 1. 1 *Sam.* 28. 11, 13, 14. In that last Context, King *Saul* ordered the Woman to call up *Samuel*; and *Samuel* appearing, she called to *Saul* and told him, that now she saw *Elohim* (God) ascending up. *Saul* thereupon asks her, *What form is he of?* the Woman replies, *He is an old Man.* It appears by this, that besides their Kings and Magistrates, the Jews gave also the Name *Elohim* to the Prophets. But that was the very word used by the Apostle *Thomas* to our Saviour; the Greeks translate it by Θεὸς, the English by the word *God.* Therefore when 'tis used of a *Man*, we are not to suppose, that the Speaker intends to call such Man *God*; or that he owns him for a Person who is *true God*; but he uses it in such sense, as the Jews and other Eastern Nations used it; for a Person of Eminent Dignity, or Worth. The Woman said of *Samuel*, then rising out of the Earth, I see *Elohim*, *God*; *Thomas* says of our Saviour, newly also risen, *Eloi, Eloi, my God, my God*; they both use the same word, and one no more than the other intended to call the Person of whom he spake, *the true God*, but only a venerable, or dignified Person. To be short, the Hebrew words *El* and *Elohim*, the Syriac and Chaldaic *Elohi*, *Eloi*, and the Greek Θεὸς, all which we render by the English *God*, are words of just such a Latitude in Holy Scripture, and among the Jews and other Oriental Nations, as the word *LORD* is with us; for we use that word indifferently, sometimes of God, sometimes of Persons in Dignity, and leave our meaning to be judged by the true and known Quality of the Person to whom we speak. We do not think or fear we shall be understood, as making a Man to be God, because we call him by a Name by which also we call God. This is the very case before us, *Thomas* says to our Saviour *Eloi*, a Name used of God and of Persons in Dignity; and he expected not to be mistaken, because the Person to whom he spoke was known to be a *Man*, and not *God*.

'Tis *likely* the before-mentioned is the true Interpretation of the objected Texts; and 'tis certainly so, if *Thomas* meant those words to our Saviour: But divers Learned Persons, even among our Opposers, have been of Opinion, that *My Lord, and my God* (or, O my Lord! O my God!) are only words of Admiration and Thanks directed (not to our Saviour, but) to God; they are an *Exclamation*, expressing the Apostle's Wonder and Amazement to find that his Master was indeed risen. Of this Opinion was *Nestorius* Archbishop of *Constantinople*, and that most Learned Person *Theodorus* of *Mopsuest.* 'Tis true, the Evangelist saith, *Thomas answered, and said unto him*, (unto Christ) *My Lord, and my God!* or, *O* my Lord! *O* my God! but this hinders not, but that the Exclamation was addressed to God *as its Object*, tho it was also an Answer to our Saviour, and to what he had said *ver.* 27. See the *Brief History of the Unitarians*, on *John* 20. 28.

CHAP. VII.

On the Texts out of the Epistles.

HE thinks much weight may be laid on Rom. 9. 5. *Of whom, as concerning the Flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.* Like to which Text is *Rom.* 1. 3. *Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the Seed of* David, *according to the Flesh.*

He saith hereupon, that these words, *According to the Flesh*, and, *as concerning the Flesh*, intimate plainly, that *according to something else* the Lord Christ had another Original, and was not *wholly* of the Jews. This *something else* is the (supposed) Divine Nature of our Saviour; according to which, say they, he is derived from God; as *according to the Flesh*, he is from the Jews.

Our present Author notes farther, that the Lord Christ in the former of the before-quoted Texts, is not only expressly called *God*, but *God over all, blessed for evermore*; so all the Original Greek Copies read. And as for Translations, if there are any which favour the Socinians, they are not however much to be regarded. I answer,

1. As to the words, *As concerning the Flesh*, and *According to the Flesh*, they never signify, as Trinitarians would here interpret, *according to the Human Nature*, as if Christ had also a Divine Nature. We shall easily find the meaning of those Phrases, by some other Texts of Scripture, in which there is no Ambiguity: Rom. 9. 3. *My Kinsmen according to the Flesh.* Rom. 4. 1. Abraham *our Father, as pertaining to the Flesh.* Col. 3. 22. *Servants, obey in all things your Masters according to the Flesh.* Will our Opposers say here, that *Abraham*, or *Paul*'s Kinsmen, or Masters, must be supposed to have a Divine Nature, because of these words, *According to the Flesh*, and *As concerning the Flesh?* 'tis easy to see, that these Expressions are only as much as to say, *According to the Body*; and that they signify to us, that *Abraham* is the Father of the Jews, *according to their Bodies*, as God is the Father of their Souls and Spirits; and the Jews were *Paul*'s Kinsmen, *according to the Body*, but not of Kin to him in respect of *Likeness in Faith or Manners*: also that Masters are Masters over our Bodies, not of our Spirits and Minds. Therefore in the other Texts also, where Christ is said to be the Seed of *Abraham*, of *Israel* and of *David*, *according to the Flesh*: the real and whole meaning is this, That according to his Body or *outward Man*, he descended of the House of *David*, and of the Stock of *Israel* and *Abraham*, as had been promised concerning him in the Prophets, but his Spirit or Soul was from God. Here again we interpret Scripture by it self: let our Opposers shew a Reason why they decline an Interpretation which the Scripture it self affords to us, and how it comes to be Heresy, to understand the meaning of one Text, by the help of such other Texts as are confest to be clear and evident?

2. He saith, the former of these Texts expressly calls the Lord Christ *God*, and *God over all, blessed for ever*; and that all Greek Copies agree in this reading. But he might have taken notice out of *Grotius*, that the Greek Copies used by the Author of the Syriac, had not the word *God*; they only say of our Saviour here, *the Blessed over all.* The same illustrious Interpreter observes, that *Erasmus* had noted, that the Copies of St. *Cyprian*, St. *Hilary*, and St. *Chrysostom*, had only *the Blessed over all*, or above all, without the word *God*. These are Observations which destroy our Author's Argument from this Text; but because he knew

not what to say to them, he took no notice of them: But it is an impious thing for a Writer, to endeavour to *cheat* his Reader in such Questions as these. When it appears by so great Authorities, that the Ancient Reading was *other ways* than we read in our present Copies; or that the reading was then *various* and *uncertain*; how can such Texts, or such Expressions be admitted *as Proofs*, in so great a Question as this before us? Is it advisable or safe, to argue against the Unity of God, or to build Articles of Faith on *suspected* Texts? the Reading ought to be *indubitable*, else the Inference drawn from it, will also be *uncertain*. An Article of Faith must have a sure Foundation, else 'tis not *Faith*, but a *precarious Conjecture*.

3. But allowing now, that the Word *God* is rightly read in this Text; two of the most eminent Critics, and principal Masters in the Greek Tongue, have observed, that St. *Paul*'s words should have been *pointed*, and *read* after this manner: *Of whom as concerning the Flesh, Christ is come; The God over all be blessed for ever. Amen.* So *Curcellæus* and *Erasmus* translate here. According to this Rendring, our Saviour is not here called *God over all*; but the Apostle gives Thanks to God over all, for his unspeakable Gift, our Lord Christ.

Our Author saith, that if there be any Translations of this Text, which favour the Socinians, they are *not much to be regarded*: But this is an Answer, fitter for an *Old Woman* to make, than for a Writer in these Questions. Seeing He undertakes to confute the Socinians, he ought to have shown, that the Translation which confirms their Doctrine, is some-way faulty: He should have answered the *Critical* Reason, which *Erasmus* and *Curcellæus* give of their Translation. They observe, that if the words [*God over all*] had been intended of our Lord Christ; the Apostle should have said in the Greek, ὁ ὢν, not ὁ ὢν: and I doubt not that our Author was aware that those Critics were in the right; and therefore he willingly overlook'd both the Translation, and the Reason of it.

If you, Sir, say to me, this being a Critical Dispute, how should an *Unlearned* Man be able to judg, which of the two Senses was intended by the Apostle? What Ground can such a one have to say, the Trinitarian Translation is not Good? Yes, he is as much qualified to judg, as the most Learned. For seeing the words may be (confessedly by both Parties) rendred two ways, he may be sure, *that* is the true Reading and Rendring, which agrees with *Evident* Reason, and with the rest of Scripture: both which allow of but one Person, who is *God over all*; and if there were more such Persons, there must of necessity be more Gods. This Reasoning directs him, which Side he is to take; not only in this Question, but in all other Questions: Whatsoever the Question is, if a Text or Texts be alledged, that may be translated several ways; *that* is the *true* Translation, which is firmed by *evident* Reason, and other *clear* Texts; and that is a *false* Translation, which would introduce an Opinion contrary to Reason, or to other *indisputable* Texts. Therefore the Faith of the Unlearned, may be as certain and well-grounded, as the Faith of the greatest Critic: for either other clear and indisputable Texts, or a demonstrative Reason, presents it self, and dissolves the Difficulties.

And if this were not so, it would not be the Duty of the Unlearned; nay, 'twould be contrary to their Duty, to be of any Persuasion or *Party* at all; such must neither be Protestants nor Papists, Socinians nor Trinitarians, Remonstrants nor Calvinists, nor of any other Sect, because of this Pretence, that they cannot make a *critical* Judgment of different *Translations*. But no Party will dare to say this: therefore say I, the Unlearned may, and have a right to be of a particular Side and Persuasion; on this Account, that by help of clear Texts, or of evident Reason, they may in all Questions easily discern, which side they ought to take. I will add, that oft-times the *Unprejudiced* and *Judicious* unlearned Person,

sees farther and clearer, than the *Interested*, *Prejudiced* and *Unjudicious* Critic, or other Learned Person. But of this I have said enough, in that General *Preface* to some of our Pamphlets; which has this Title, *An Exhortation to a Serious and Impartial Enquiry*: where I show, that this is the very Principle on which the *Reformation* proceeded; and that in taking it away, the Reformation must fall, and we must all return to *Rome*.

His *last* Scripture-Allegation is from *Phil.* 2. 5, &c. *Let this Mind be in you, which was in Christ Jesus: who being in the Form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took on him the Form of a Servant; and was made in the Likeness of Men; and being found in fashion as a Man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross. Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name above every Name.*

Mr. *Bilb.* has said but very little on this Context; Others of his Party have made advantage of almost every Clause thereof. The Lord Christ, say they, *was in the Form of God*: What can that mean, but that *He was God*? for the *Form* of a thing, is the very *Nature* of it. And that this is a true Interpretation, we certainly know by the next words, which say; *He thought it not robbery to be equal with God*: Had He not been God, it had been the greatest Robbery and Sacrilege possible, to think himself equal with God. 'Tis true, He *humbled himself*, and *took on him the Form of a Servant*, and was *made in the likeness of Men*, and was *found in fashion as a Man*, and *became obedient to the Death of the Cross*. But even these very Expressions are such, as plainly intimate, that all this was nothing else but *his Condescension*; He stoop'd to these things, only because for great and weighty Reasons He was pleased so to do. Of those Reasons (or Ends) the Apostle here mentions one, *to set us an Example*: Let that Mind (saith he) be in you, which was in Christ Jesus; who being so Great a Person, yet humbled himself to take *the Form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness of Men.*

I will here, Sir, tell you a Story. A certain Country-man that happened to live in a Parish, where the Minister used to insist very often on these Questions, about the Divinity and the *Incarnation* of our Saviour, turned down in his Bible *the Proofs* alledged by his Minister; and being a Man, though of no Learning, yet of a Good Capacity, he found at length how to satisfy himself of the Insufficiency of all the Minister's Proofs, on behalf of the Divinity of our Saviour: only he was puzzled with this Context one of the *Philippians*, that Christ was in *the Form of God*, and *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*, &c. After much thinking, he Imagined that he could give a reasonable Account even of this Context, all but that one Expression, *He thought it not robbery to be equal with God*. Here he stuck; for if Christ be equal with God, sure he is (as the Church says) a Person of God, or of the Deity, and the Trinitarian Doctrine must be true. At length, it came into his mind, that there might be some Error in the Translation; and therefore he ask'd his Minister, Whether the words were altogether so in the *true Bible*, (so he called the Original Greek) as they are in the English Bible: I suspect, says he, that the word *It* (in this Clause, he thought *it not robbery to be equal with God*) is not in what you use to call the Original, and out of which you often correct our way of reading in the English Bibles; I judg that the Apostle said only, *He* (Christ) *thought not robbery to be equal with God*. The Minister was forced to confess, that *It* was not in the Greek; and that it should have been printed, as the *words of Supplement* usually are, in a different Character from the rest of the Verse. But then, Sir, says the Country-man; If the Apostle says, that *Christ thought not robbery to be equal with God*, it should seem, it would indeed have been robbery, if he had thought himself equal with God: So that the Apostle's meaning will

will be this; "Jesus Christ conceived not "this thing (this Robbery and Sacrilege, in "his mind, to be equal with God, or that "he was equal with God.

This is my Rule; I assure you, Sir, I do not make it, I had it from a Friend of Yours, whose Veracity you will not question: So true is it, that after all the wretched Disguisings of Holy Scripture, by Translations *grossly false*, an industrious and sagacious Enquirer, though Unlearned, may by himself enquire out the great Truth of Christianity, *the Unity of God*. I confess, such have an hard Task, because our Opposers have never owned in their Margin, any other *Reading* or *Rendring* in the Texts controverted between them and us, but only that which they have *contrived* to serve their own Turns: But by the Story I have told you, it appears not to be impossible to find Truth, even without the help of a better Translation.

Mr. *Milbourn* says, at *Pag.* 374. that this Context of the Apostle to the *Philippians*, is so clear for the Divinity of our Saviour, that Trinitarians may refer themselves concerning this Matter, to the *merriest Stranger to Christianity*, that has but read this Context. For what can be more plain? *He was in the Form of God*, He thought it not robbery to be *Equal with God*; He humbled himself to take *the Form of a Servant*, and *the Likeness and Fashion of a Man*. In short, *a Heathen* would say, that the Person of whom these things are spoken, must undoubtedly be more than *Man* or *Creature*.

This (he thinks) is a home Charge on the Socinians; but our Country-man would have made our Author to abate a great deal of his Assurance: He would tell him, 'tis true, Sir, the Lord Christ *was in the Form of God*; but so also are all other Men; the Holy Scriptures inform us, that *Adam* and all other Men, are made in the Similitude, Form or Likeness of God. Which is so far from proving, that *Adam*, or Christ, are God, or a Person of God, that it *demonstratively* proves, that neither of them is God; because what are *like*, are never *the same*. 'Tis true, our Blessed Saviour was *more* in the Form, Fashion, or Likeness of God, than any other Man: for besides all that Resemblance that we have to God, by our *Reason*, our *Superiority* over the Creatures, the immortal *ruling Nature* of our Souls; besides all this, He had a more perfect Holiness, and a Power and Authority over Devils, Diseases, the Winds and Seas; and this Form of God was given to the Lord Christ, that he might confirm by his Miracles that Holy Doctrine which he was to deliver from God to Men. Thus the *Country-man* would enlighten Mr. *Milbourn's Heathen*; concerning the first Expression, *He was in the Form* (or Likeness) *of God*.

But then the Heathen would say farther; *He* (Christ) *thought it not robbery to be Equal to God*.

You are mistaken, good Sir, says the Country-man, for our Apostle's words are, *He thought not robbery to be Equal with God*: Of which, the plain meaning is; He was not so Sacrilegious, as to think in his Mind, that because he had some *likeness* to God, a far greater than any Man, or (perhaps) Angels, therefore He was Equal with God. Because though He was so highly *in the Form of God*, yet he remembreth what he saith elsewhere, *All Power is GIVEN to me*, Matth. 28. 18. But on the contrary, the Power of him who is *true God*, is not *given*, but is originally his own, the result of his own Eternal Nature.

As for those Expressions, *He made himself of no Reputation*, and *took on him the Form* (or Likeness) *of a Servant*; they are thus to be understood: He declined the Esteem and Reputation of this World, by concealing the Miracles which he did; charging (oft-times) those that were healed, not to divulge the Matter: Nay, He took on him the Form of a Servant, by suffering Injury and Reproach, without answering again: *When he was reviled, he reviled not again.*

The

The Apostle adds, That *being in the Likeness of Men, and found in fashion as a Man, he humbled himself to the Death of the Cross.* At these words begins a new sense, neither is the word [*And*] prefixed to them in the Greek; their meaning is this. "Farther, "tho Christ was in the Likeness or Form "of God, by the extraordinary Power and "Authority granted to him; yet because "he remembred, that he was made in every respect in the common *Likeness* and "*Fashion* of all other Men, *Like to his Brethren in all things, Sin excepted*; therefore "upon all occasions he readily humbled "himself; He even submitted himself to "be taken, and crucified by the Jewish and "Roman Magistracy, tho He could most "easily have delivered himself from them, "because He knew that by that kind of "Death God should be greatly glorified, "and the Gospel confirmed. On this account, as well as on some others, God "has highly exalted him, and given to him "the Name above every Name, *King of* "*Kings, and Lord of Lords.* Rev. 19. 16.

Mr. *Milb.* crastily supposes, that his *Heathen* should conclude for the Divinity of our Saviour, from this only Context to the *Philippians*, without being before acquainted with Christianity, or with Scripture: but why is He afraid to let his *Heathen* be acquainted with Christianity and with Scripture, but only with this Text? is it not because the Christian Profession of *but one God*, and the express words of our Saviour, *My Father is greater than I*; and again, *I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God*: Is it not (I say) because the knowledg of these other Texts, and very many the like, would make his *Heathen* to interpret this place to the *Philippians*, as the Country-man did? But he knows besides, that some of the principal Interpreters and Criticks of his own Party, have given up to the Unitarians this Context of St. *Paul* to the *Philippians*; they ingenuously own, that this whole Discourse of the Apostle was by him intended of our Lord Christ, *as Man*, and not as God: He may see a considerable Collection of Authors, *Fathers* as well as *Moderns*, who make this honest Confession: In *Chr. Sandius* his Interpret. Paradox. p. 359, 360. Among the rest there cited, *M. Luther* (*de dupl. Justitia*) is very express and clear.

Let us, if you please, Sir, lay the whole Interpretation before given into one view, that the Reader may more easily make a Judgment of it. "Let such a Mind be in "you, O *Philippians!* as was in the glorious "*Head and Captain of our Salvation*, the "Lord Christ. For He being in the Likeness or Form of God, by an extraordinary Sanctity, and a miraculous Power over "Diseases and Devils, conferred on him "by God; He did not (like *Lucifer*) conceive in his Mind that Impiety and Robbery to be equal with God: but (on the "contrary) He made himself of no Reputation, and took the Likeness of a "Man of Servile Condition, by concealing "the great Miracles which he did, and by "bearing Injuries and Reproaches, without answering again. Being made in the "Likeness of all other Men, and found in "the common Fashion of a Man; He submitted to be taken by the Jews, and to "undergo the Death of the Cross, for the "Glory of God, and the Salvation of Men. "And because He was thus affected towards God's Honour, and the Good of "Men; therefore has God highly exalted "him, making him Head of the Church, "both that in Heaven, and that on Earth; "and giving to him that Name above every Name, *King of Kings, and Lord of* "*Lords.* But hitherto of the Concertation between Mr. *Milbourn's Heathen* and our *Country man*; I submit to the Reader, which of them has best understood St. *Paul*.

But I desire you, Sir, to consider, what *wild* Work our Opposers make with these Words and this Context of St. *Paul*; and how they make no scruple to render him guilty of the most palpable Self-Contradictions in one and the same Breath. The Lord

Christ,

Christ, saith this Apostle, *was in the Form of God*; that is, say our Opposers, he had the very Nature of God, or was truly and really God; and *He thought it not Robbery* (so They make the Apostle to speak) *to be equal with God*. Now, if He was *God*, how could He *be equal with God*? for nothing is ever said to be equal with it self; Equality and Likeness must be between *several* and *divers* things.

Well, He was God, and was equal with God, and yet *made himself of no Reputation, took on him the Form of a Servant, was made in the likeness and fashion of Men; nay, humbled himself to Death, even the Death of the Cross*. But 'tis both Morally and Physically, or naturally impossible, that God should do any of these things, undergo any of these Changes. Why do they not perceive, that He who is true God, cannot *make himself of no Reputation*; or take the Form of a Servant, the Likeness and Fashion of Men; or submit himself to Death?

The Apostle goes on, *Wherefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every Name*. O strange! God exalts God, and *gives* to him (which implies that He had it not before) a Name above every Name. I would know, what Name could be given to him above the Name he had before?

I do not pretend, Sir, that they own this Interpretation in the very terms I have here set it down: but this I say, that admitting their Hypothesis, that the Lord Christ is true God; this and no other was, I must not say the Apostle's *Sense*, but his meaning it was. You may please, Sir, to compare it with that easy and natural Paraphrase of the Socinians, which was before mentioned, and then tell me, which of them would be chosen even by a (sensible) *Heathen*, to whom our Opposer has thought fit to make his Appeal.

CHAP. VIII.

On what he objects from the Actions or Miracles of our Saviour.

After he has done with particular Texts, our Author (from P. 381.) spends some Sheets in recounting certain *Actions* of our Saviour, by which it may appear that he was true God, that one true God whom the Scriptures every where propound to us, as the only legitimate Object of Faith and Worship. He saith, for instance, our Saviour did many wonderful Miracles, and that too *in his own Name*, not as the Minister or Instrument of another, but in *a commanding way*; as when he rebuked the Winds and Waves, and cast out Devils. He healed Diseases *by a Virtus issuing from himself*; as appears by the Woman who was cured by only touching his Garment, and by his own words thereupon, *Virtus is gone out of me*. Nor did he cure only the Distempers of the Body, but those of the Mind and Soul; for he invited to him *the weary and heavy-laden*, promising that he would *give them Rest*; which is a sort of Language never used by any Prophet, or meer Man: nay, he forgave to divers their Sins, which ('tis certain) only God can do.

As a further Display of his Divinity, 'tis said of him, *He knew what was in Man*; and he saith of himself, *I am He who searcheth the Reins and Hearts*. There can be no greater Omniscience than this, nor can Omniscience belong to any but God.

After his Resurrection, *He opened the Understandings* of his Disciples.

He *breathed on them*, and thereby conferred the Holy Spirit, which being God's *Inspiration*, even in the Opinion of the Socinians, How can it be given by any but God?

Afterwards *He himself* shed on them the same Holy Spirit in a miraculous manner, when he caused the Spirit to descend on them, in the likeness of cloven Tongues: but if he were not *God*, how should he give *the Spirit of God* to others?

They are his own words to his Disciples, *As my Father sent me, so send I you*; but that could not be said by him, if he had not the *same* Authority (or were not equal) with the Father.

After his Ascension his Disciples did their Miracles *in his Name*, or only *by Faith in him*; but no meer Man can enable another to do Miracles; nor can Faith in a meer Man avail to that purpose.

Lastly, He sent *St. Paul* to be a Minister to the Gentiles, to convert them to God; that so, saith he, they may have Remission of Sins, and an Inheritance among those *who are sanctified by Faith in me*; or by believing in me. And in doing all this, saith he farther to that Apostle, *I will deliver thee from the People, and the Gentiles, to whom I send thee*; Acts 26. 16, 17, 18. Mr. *Milb*, seems to think there is a great Force in these Allegations, towards the evincing that the Lord Christ was indeed God; and with these Proofs he concludes his present Argument from Scripture. Let us examine what he hath said, part by part.

He saith, first, our Saviour did Miracles, *in his own Name, not as the Minister or Instrument of another*. But this is not the Language of Scripture; the express words of our Saviour, and the whole current of Scripture are against it. John 17. 28. *I am not come of my self*. John 5. 43. *I am come in my Father's Name*. John 5. 30. *I can do nothing of my self*. Mat. 12. 28. *I cast out Devils by the Spirit of God*. John 14. 10. *The Father that dwelleth in me* (to wit, by his Spirit) *he doth the Works*. Acts 2. 22. *Jesus of Nazareth, a Man approved of God among you, by Miracles, Wonders and Signs which God did by him in the midst of you*. Assuredly these Texts declare as evidently as in words can be done, that the Lord Christ was no more than *the Instrument and Minister of God*, and of his Spirit, in working Miracles; and that it was in the *Father's Name*, not in his own, that he appeared and acted.

But he healed Diseases *by a Virtue issuing from himself*; for he said, *Virtue is gone out of me*. That there was a *Balsamick* and Sanative Virtue in the Body of our Saviour, I will not deny; but neither can it be denied, that the like Virtue was also given by God to the Bodies of some of the Apostles: for Handkerchiefs from their Bodies, and their Shadows healed many, *Acts* 5. 15. & 19. 12.

Nor is there any more Force in that, that the Lord Christ invites to him *the Heavy-laden*, promising to give them *Rest* to their Souls. For he gave *Rest* to Souls sensible of the Guilt and Burden of Sin, *by his Doctrine*; which every Gospel-Preacher may do, nay, ought to do. A Gospel-Preacher is to declare to the Sensible and Penitent, the Forgiveness and Absolution of God, and thereby gives them *Rest* and Peace.

But tis marvellous that this Author should urge it as a Proof of our Saviour's Divinity, that He declared to some Persons, whose Faith appeared in visible Acts of Piety and Trust in God, that their Sins were forgiven; for sure he knows what is said to the Apostles at *John* 20. 23. *Whose Sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whose Sins ye retain, they are retained*. Let him show, if he can, that our Saviour ever claimed any higher Authority or Power than the Apostles are here vested with, by Command from God. But I think it were not hard to prove, that in all these Texts, the word *Sins* is put for the Effect of Sins, even *Diseases*, so as to make this sense; that our

Saviour

Saviour and his Apostles had Authority and Power, either to loose Men from their Infirmities and Ails, or to leave them in them, as they should see reason and cause, either for the *Spiritual* Benefit of the Person, or for Confirmation of the Gospel, by such Sights and Wonders.

Our Lord Christ *knew what was in Man*, saith the Evangelist St. *John*. But he doth not say, that he knew it *of himself*, by a Natural Omniscience, without Revelation from God.

The Prophet *Abijah* knew what was in the Mind of the Queen of *Israel*, 1 Kings 14. 6. *Elisha* knew what his Servant *Gehazi* had done, and what he purposed, 2 *Kings* 5. 22. The same Prophet knew the Counsels that the King of *Syria* took against the King of *Israel*, 2 *Kings* 6. 9, 12. He told *Hazael*, not only what *was in his Heart*, but what should be there in time to come, 2 *Kings* 8. 12. The Holy Scriptures do not expressly say, that the Knowledg which these Prophets had of *what was in Man*; or, what is the same thing, the secret Thoughts of their Hearts, was only *derivative*, or by God's Revelation: They supposed there was no need to instruct or warn the Reader concerning a matter that was self-evident. But, as if foreseeing the monstrous Doctrine that some would advance concerning the great Minister and Prophet of the New Testament, the Lord Christ; and designing to arm the Faithful against it; they have been careful to tell us *directly* and *explicitly*, that the Prophetick Knowledg that was in him, was derivative, or *by Revelation from God*, not from himself, or by a Natural Omniscience of his own. Rev. 1. 1, *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him, to shew unto his Servants things that must shortly come to pass. And He* (Christ) *sent and signified it by his Angel* (or, by his Messenger) *to his Servant* John. How can a considering Man doubt, that if our Saviour knew the things which must very shortly come to pass, only by God's Revelation of them to him; that his Knowledg too of what was in the Hearts and Minds of Men, must be also by God's Revelation, or the Inhabitation of the Spirit of God in him?

But our Author urgeth, that the Lord Christ saith, *I am He which searcheth the Reins and Hearts*: Rev. 2. 23.

He ought to know, that *to search the Heart and Reins*, is an Hebrew and Scripture Phrase and form of speaking, and signifies no more but this, *to know the most secret Thoughts and Purposes of the Mind and Heart*. This is a Property that can belong only to God, to know (or, as the Hebrew speaks, to *search*) the Hearts and Thoughts, if you mean thereby, *originally*, or *of himself*, or *by his own natural and proper Omniscience*: but the Prophets, and more especially the Lord Christ, know the Hearts and Reins *by God's Revelation to them*, and search the Thoughts *by the inhabiting Spirit of God in them*. When therefore our Saviour saith here, *I search the Hearts*, he meant this, I know the Thoughts of the Heart, *by God's Revelation to me*, or *by his Inhabiting Spirit in me*. In a word, God only knoweth the Thoughts of the Heart, and *what is in Man*, originally, of himself, or by his own proper and natural Omniscience: But Prophets search or know the Hearts, and what is in Man, *secondarily*, *derivatively*, *by God's Revelation to them*, by his inhabiting Spirit in them. We are assured that this last only was our Saviour's meaning, in these words, *I search the Hearts*, by the first words of this Book of Revelation, before quoted, even these, *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him*. There could be no need that God should make a Revelation to him, if he himself knew the Reins and Hearts by a natural Omniscience of his own.

We are not therefore to stick at the mere words, *I search the Heart*, but to consider the Import or Sense of that Phrase in the Scripture-Language; which signifying only this, to know the Thoughts of the Heart or Mind; they do not prove the Person of whom they are spoken, to be Omni-

 scient,

Omniscient, or God, unless it had been said He searcheth (or He knoweth) the Hearts *by his own Omniscience*, and not (as 'tis said of our Saviour) *by Revelation from God*, or God's inhabiting Spirit.

When the Lord Christ *opened the Understandings* of the two Disciples, *that they might understand the Scriptures*; this was not an Act of his Power, but the Effect of the Discourse he made to them: He opened their Understandings, to understand the *Prophetic* Scriptures, *by explaining those Scriptures to them.*

He conferred a Measure of the Holy Spirit, by the External Sign of *breathing on the Disciples.* We can no more infer from hence that he was God, than that the Apostles also were so many Gods, because they gave the Spirit by the External Sign of *laying on their Hands*, Acts 19. 6. The *latter* was as great a Miracle as the *former*, and both of them the effect of God's Power, not of Man's.

But 'tis false, what our Author here adds; that our Lord Christ did *Himself shed on them the Holy Spirit*, when he caused the Spirit to descend on them in the form of Cloven Tongues. The Apostle indeed saith, *He* (Christ) *hath shed forth this* (this miraculous Participation of the Spirit) *which ye now see and hear*: But he saith not, as our Author reports his words, He *himself* hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear; for it was not He *himself*, but He *by the Gift of God*, that shed forth the Spirit on them. Let us hear the whole Verse, *Acts* 2. 23. *Therefore He* (Christ) *being by the right Hand of God exalted, and having received* (or obtained) *of the Father, his Promise of the Holy Ghost; He hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.* Here indeed the Spirit is said to be shed forth by the Lord Christ on the Apostles, but not by Him *himself*; but He shed it forth, *having* (saith the Text) *received it of the Father.* As who should say, having received this Power from the Father, which afterwards the Apostles also received of the Father, even the Power of conferring the Spirit: He now shed it forth on them; not He *himself*, by his own Authority or Power, but by the Warrant, Order, Grant or Commission of the Father. If our Saviour had conferred the Spirit on his Disciples, by his own Power or Authority, it would not have been said, that *having received of the Father his Promise of the Holy Ghost, he shed it abroad on his Followers.*

Let our Opposers show, that the Lord Christ was more than the Instrument, Minister and Mediator, by Whom, and at whose Instance, God shed forth the Spirit: neither this, nor any other Context ascribes more to him; and as much as is elsewhere ascribed to the Apostles, *Acts* 10. 44. *Acts* 19. 6.

They are words which our Saviour speaks to his Disciples; *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.* But it follows not from hence, that the Authority and Power of Christ, was equal to the Power and Authority of the Father: nay, the contrary rather follows; for the Messenger is but the Minister and Servant of the Sender.

After Jesus was ascended into Heaven, his Disciples did their Miracles *in his Name*; and *by Faith in him.* Acts 3. 6. *In the Name of Jesus of* Nazareth, *rise up and walk.* Ver. 16. *His Name, through Faith in his Name, hath made this Man strong.*

We confess hereupon, that Miracles were done *by the Name*, or *in the Name* of the Lord Jesus, and *through Faith in his Name*: But how does this prove that he was God? Such Miracles prove indeed, that the Person in whose Name they are done, is a most Powerful and Effectual *Mediator* with God, but not that He himself is God; they prove, that he is acceptable to God; and that what he *desireth*, that also God *willeth*; but not that he is the true & proper Author of those Miracles. 'Tis a *particular* Honour that God is pleased to do to the Lord Christ, that *in his Name* Wonders should be done; and that *some* who believed in his Name, should.

should on that account be enabled to do Miracles: But when our Opposers infer from hence, therefore Christ is God, this is no *Necessary* or *Natural* Consequence; because nothing hinders but that God may confer the same Honour on any other Person or Thing. Nor, secondly, is it a true Consequence; because we are assured, by innumerable *express* and *clear* Testimonies, that the Lord Christ is not God. As, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Jesus Christ.*

Finally; Our Lord promis'd, that he would *deliver his Apostle from the People, and from the Gentiles*; and declares, that *we are sanctified by Faith in his Name*, or by believing in him, *Acts* 26. 17, 18, &c. He delivered indeed that Apostle, from very many Machinations of the Jews, and Conspiracies of the Gentiles; but all this as *Mediator*, not as *God*: by his Intercession, *which* (as this Apostle saith) *he ever liveth to make*, on behalf of all the Faithful; and more especially of such as are *extraordinarily* commissioned to the Work of propagating the Gospel in Heathen Nations, as St. *Paul* was.

As to our being *sanctified* (i. e. made Holy) *by Faith in Christ*, or by believing in him, it was never questioned, I think, by any; but the meaning of the Expression is only this, that such as sincerely believe the Lord Christ, and the Gospel or Doctrine by him delivered, do *sanctify themselves*; they refrain from every Evil Work and Word; their Faith does dispose and incline them, of its own Nature and Tendency, to Sanctification and Holiness; this is the only meaning of our being *sanctified by Faith in Christ*.

CHAP. IX.

On what is alledged from the Fathers.

OUR Author passes from *sacred* Authorities, to *Ecclesiastical* and *Profane*, for proving the Doctrines of the Trinity, and the Divinity and Incarnation of our Saviour.

He quotes the Account which *Pliny* gives to the Emperor *Trajan*, concerning the Christians; that they were wont to meet *before Day, Et Carmen Christo quasi Deo, To sing Psalms to Christ as if he were a God.*

He cites also a Dialogue, supposed to be *Lucian's*, in which that Author jeers the God who is *Three and One*. These two Authors were very Ancient, within about 100 Years after Christ; and their words (before quoted) show, How *early* the belief of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of our Saviour was found among Christians.

For *Ecclesiastical* Writers, he brings some Fragments out of *Justin, Ignatius, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Tertullian, Arnobius, Cyprian, Lactantius, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Felix*; also out of the Councils of *Nice, Antioch*, and *Constantinople*.

He saith; the Socinians are apt to appeal in these Questions, to the *Anti-Nicen* Fathers before-named; and that several great Men, such as *Erasmus, Grotius, Petavius*, and others, yield this Point to us.

I will make no Advantage of our Author's Ignorance in this Matter; I will freely own to you, Sir, that the Socinians never Appeal (in these Questions) to the Fathers, whether *Anti-Nicen*, or others, who are now extant. We grant, they were in Sentiments very different from ours, all the *Anti-Nicen*

Fathers, I mean, *whose works have been suffer'd to come down to our Times*, were in the Opinion (concerning God and the Lord Christ) afterwards called *Arrianism*; except (perhaps) *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who seems to have held the same with *Socinus*.

Nor do *Erasmus*, *Petavius*, *Grotius*, and other Criticks grant to us, as he supposes, that the *Ante-Nicen* Fathers were of our Opinion; they have granted those Fathers, not to us, but to the *Arrians*. They grant, those Fathers did not hold the Doctrine of the Trinity, or of the Divinity of our Saviour, *in such manner as 'tis now held by the Church*; for the Church holds a Trinity of Three *Coequal* and *Coeternal* Persons, all of them jointly and equally *Creators*, none of them *Creatures*: but those Fathers held a Trinity, in which only the First Person is *truly* God, or *the most high God*; the Second and Third are *Creatures*, though also they were *the Creators* (according to these Fathers) *of the other Creatures*. They say indeed sometimes, that the Son is *Coeternal*, and a Creator: but by Coeternal they mean only, that he was not made *in Time*, but in that *Eternity* which did precede *Time*, and the Creation of the World. They call that Duration, *Time*, which began with the World, and which is both Made and Measured by the Motion of the Sun, and other Heavenly Bodies; and that Duration is by them called *Eternity*, which preceded those Bodies, and the Motions which make *Time*. Therefore when they call the Son, *Coeternal*; which (I think) is not found in all their Writings above once or twice; they do not mean, that He was *Really* and *Actually* Coexistent with the Father from all Eternity: But 'tis their Intention to say, He was *made* by the Father in that Duration which Philosophy calls *Eternity*, some space before the World was made, that He might be the Father's *Instrument* and *Minister* in creating all things. Hereby they acknowledg, that the Son was in some sense *a Creator*, and *God*; but it was only as He was the Father's *Minister*, *Instrument* and *Servant* (those are the Terms they use) in making all things: He was *a Creator* and *God*, with respect to all other Creatures, but with respect (say they) to the true and most high God, He is only a Servant and a Creature.

In a word, the *Ante-Nicen* Fathers (*i. e.* those of the first 325 Years) *whose Works have been suffered to be extant*, neither held as the Unitarians do, that the Lord Christ began to have a Being, when He was born of the Virgin; nor as the Church now does, that He was *true* God, and always *actually Coexistent with God*: but they held with the Arrians, that He was *Created*, *Begotten*, or *made*, (for these are, with them, equivalent Term) in that Tract or Duration which is called, not Time, but *Eternity*; and that He was the Father's *Servant* and *Instrument*, in making *first* the Holy Ghost, *then* the rest of the Creation.

This is that which is granted by *Petavius*, *Huetius*, *Mornay*, *Erasmus*, *Grotius*, and other Criticks on the Fathers; not (as our Author supposes) that those Fathers held the Doctrine concerning God, and our Lord Christ, that is now called *Socinianism*.

But though this be so, yet we doubt not that we are able to prove, that the general Body of Christians, and an incomparable majority of their Learned Men, believed as the Unitarians now do, till about the Times of *Victor* and *Zephyrin*, Bishops of *Rome*; that is, till toward the Year of our Lord 180.

It has not availed our Opposers, that they have suppress'd the Works of those most Ancient Fathers, who are known and confess'd to have been Unitarians, such as *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, and *Theodotion*, who so excellently translated the Hebrew Bible into Greek; and *Lucianus*, who restored the Greek Copies to their first Integrity: *Artemas* and *Theodotus*, Men (noted by their Adversaries to have been) incomparably Learned, and ancienter than any of the *Orthodox* Fathers, as we now call them. *Paul*

also

also Patriarch of *Antioch*, *Photinus* Archbishop of *Sirmium*, *Marcellus* Bishop of *Ancyra*: I say, it has not advantaged our Opposers, that they have destroyed the Writings of these Fathers; for the Fathers that are still extant, give us an account of the *Opinion* of those other Fathers, thô *concealing their Arguments*. Moreover, they confess, that those first Unitarians claimed to be *the true Successors and Descendents of the Apostles, and that they derived their Doctrine from them*. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. *l.* 5. *c.* 28.

Besides this, the only Creed of all the Churches till the Council of *Nice*, and which is called *the Apostles Creed* (because it contains the true *Apostolick* Tradition) is confest on all hands to be wholly *Unitarian*. That Creed acknowledges but one God, *the Father Almighty*; and but one *only Son* of God; even him (saith this Creed) who was conceived, generated or begotten by the Holy Ghost on the Virgin *Mary*; not (as our Opposers feign) an Eternal Son, begotten of the Essence of God his Father. But I will not, Sir, now dilate on these things, it shall be done in a Treatise by it self, if it please God to give me *Leisure* and *Opportunity*. In the mean time I appeal to those Learned Criticks, *Petavius* and others before mentioned, that the ordinary presence of such Scribblers and Sciolists as our Author, is utterly false and ungrounded, even this, that the Ante-nicen Fathers held the Doctrine of the Trinity, *as the Church now does*.

As for the Scoffs of *Lucian* on the God who is *Three and One, One and Three*, not having the Book by me, I cannot tell, whether he meant to jeer the Trinity of the *Platonick* Philosophers, or of the Christians; I conjecture he means the former.

Neither was he so ancient as some give out; the best Criticks make him to have flourish'd about the Year of our Lord 176, when the *new* Doctrines were grown very rife and common.

The Account that *Pliny* gives of the Christians to the Emperor *Trajan*, is *ancient*; but (in the particular objected to us) very *uncertain*. The Copies of *Pliny* in *Tertullian's* Time, express the matter thus, *Ad canendum Christo & Deo, They sang Psalms of Praise to Christ and to God*; not (*ut Deo*) to Christ *as God*. The very words of *Tertullian* are these; "*Pliny* in his Letter "to *Trajan*, objects nothing else to them, "but that they were obstinate in refusing "to sacrifice; and that they held (*actus "ante lucanos, ad canendum Christo & Deo*) "Meetings before day, to sing to Christ "and to God. *Tertul. Apol. adv. Gentes*, c. 2. I make use of an Edition of *Tertullian*, with the Notes of all the Criticks, published by *Rigaltius* at *Paris*; yet none of them dislikes the Reading by *Tertullian*, or prefers to it the *Modern* Reading.

But admitting now, that we were to read *ut Deo*, as to a God: *Pliny* in these words might speak only his own Opinion, not the Opinion of the Christians: He might conjecture, that because the Christians sang certain *Compositions* in Praise of the Lord Christ in their Meetings, therefore they held him to be a God. Or, *ut Deo*, may be translated, *as if he were a God*; so as to shake this sense: "They sing Psalms and Hymns to "Christ, as if he were a God, whom them-"selves confess to have been a Man; for "Hymns are not usually sung but only to "the Gods. However it be, this Citation makes not much to the purpose; at most, it only proves, that even in *Pliny's* time, some began to corrupt the Evangelical Doctrine concerning the Unity of God.

CHAP.

CHPA. X.

On divers Passages out of the Evangelists and Epistles.

FROM the Fathers, our Author returns again to the Scriptures, and advances an Argument to prove our Saviour's Divinity from those Texts which seem to intimate, that the Lord Christ is to be *prayed unto*; and also from others, in which 'tis said, that even while he was upon Earth, he was *worshipped* by some, and did not refuse the *worship* paid to him.

He saith, no Person can be the proper Object of Divine Worship, such as *Prayer* is, but He who is Omniscient, Omnipotent, and Omnipresent; and that if the Socinians ascribe these Properties to our Saviour, they make him to be *true God*.

That Jesus Christ was *worshipped*, and that he *ought* to be worshipped, he proves from these Texts; Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11. *God hath highly exalted him, and given to him a Name above every Name: That at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things on Earth, and things under the Earth; And that every Tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord.* Mat. 28. 16, 17. *The eleven Disciples went away into* Galilee, *into a Mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshipped him.* With others the like.

Then for *praying* to him, there are these Texts: Mat. 8. 25. *Lord, save us, or we perish.* Luke 17. 5. *Lord, increase our Faith.* Acts 7. 59. *Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit.* 2 Cor. 12. 8, 9. *I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me: but he said to me, My Grace is sufficient for thee.* —— *Therefore I will rather glory in my Infirmities, that the Power of Christ may rest upon me.* 1 Thess. 3. 11, 12. *God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way to you.* 1 Cor. 1. 2. *To all that (in every place) call upon the Name of the Lord Jesus.* To which last there are several other Texts which are Parallels.

Of the Invocation of Christ.

That we are to *pray* not only to God, but also to the Lord Christ, is held by very many of the Unitarians themselves; from the time that *G. Blandrata* and *F. Socinus* carried this Point against their Opposers in the Conferences and Synods of *Poland*.

Socinus and his Party urged, as Mr. *Milb.* here does, that the Apostle saith, *To all who in every place call on the Name of the Lord Christ.* It was answered, that the words of this, and other the like Texts, should have been rendred, To all who in every place *are called by the Name of the Lord Christ*; *i. e.* who from *Christ* are called *Christians*. It was said further, that admitting the Vulgar Translation, yet to *call on the Name of Christ*, imports no more but this, even *to call on his Name in Prayer*; that is, to go to God in the Name of Christ, calling on his Name, as that only Name by which we can be heard.

Socinus alledged the words of the same Apostle, *God himself even our Father, and the Lord Christ, direct our way to you.* It was answered, that this, and what follows, is not a formal *Prayer*; but the Apostle *desires* and *wishes* that his Journey to *Thessalonica* may be directed and prospered *by God*, as the Fountain of all good and favourable Providences, and *by the Lord Christ* as the Mediator who continually intercedes for all necessary Benefits for the Faithful, both Temporal Benefits and Spiritual. 'Tis in the same manner that we are to interpret the next words, *The Lord make you to abound and increase*

increase in Love: for the Efficiency of the Lord Christ (if he be the Person here meant) in conferring Grace of any kind, is only *by his Mediation*, the general Mediation he makes for all the Faithful.

Socinus went on; The Apostle saith concerning the Thorn (or Temptation) in his Flesh, that he *besought the Lord thrice* concerning it: who answered, *My Grace is sufficient for thee*: from whence the Apostle concludes, that he *will glory in his Infirmities, that the Power of Christ may rest on him*. But it was said, *the Lord* to whom the Apostle prayed, is the Lord *God*, not the Lord *Christ*; and by those words, *I will glory in my Infirmities, that the Power of Christ may rest on me*; He means, he will even boast and rejoice in his Infirmities, seeing they are the occasion of manifesting the Power of Christ; namely, the Virtue and Power of *Christ's Mediation* with God, the Effects of which do rest on him, and on all the Faithful.

Socinus alledged St. *Stephen*'s dying words, *Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit*. They replied, every one may see in the Original, that it should have been translated, *O Lord of Jesus*, (*i. e.* O God) *receive my Spirit*.

There was good reason why St. *Stephen* should use this Form, *O Lord of Jesus*, rather than barely *O my God*, or any such like: for being tried and condemned for his Faith in Christ Jesus, it was proper to make mention of him, and to bear Testimony to him with his very last and dying words. It were enough for another to say, O Lord God, receive my Spirit: But a Martyr for Christ, and the first Martyr very properly said, O thou Lord of Jesus, for whose Name and Profession I suffer, receive my Spirit.

I know not whether *Socinus* urged the words of the Apostles to our Saviour, *Lord, increase our Faith*; and again, *Lord, save us, or we perish*: I judg he was more judicious than to trifle after such a manner. For when they say, *Increase our Faith*, and *save us* from sinking in this Storm: they undoubtedly meant, that he should increase their Faith, *by his Prayers to God for them*; and that he should *save them* from sinking, by that miraculous Power which Prophets have over the Works of Nature: as when *Elisha* made Iron to swim; when he blinded the Host of the Syrians; when *Moses* divided the Red Sea, and *Joshua* broke down the Walls of *Jericho*. That this is a true Interpretation, we learn from the words of the Apostles, when the Storm ceased, and the Danger was over; *What manner of MAN*, say they, *is this, that even the Winds and Sea obey him?* They cried not out, as Mr. *Milbourn* and his Fellow *Lycaonians* do, *The Gods are come down to us in the likeness of Men*: but as sober Men bred up in the knowledg of the Scriptures, and to the acknowledgment of one only God; *What manner of MAN is this?* How great a Prophet, whom both the Sea and Winds obey?

The *first* Unitarians, who contended that we ought to pray only to God, thought that they very much confirmed the before-mentioned Answers, by urging first, that our Saviour being consulted about the *Object* and the *Matter* of Prayers, answered; When ye pray, say, *Our Father which art in Heaven*. As who should say, God is the only Object of Prayer, you can address to no other but to Him: but go to him as to your *Father*, with the ingenuous Assurance of *Children*, not the Dread and Awe of meer Creatures and *Vassals*. Secondly, Speaking also of the time of his Resurrection and Ascension into Heaven, he saith, *John* 16. 23. *In that day ye shall ask me nothing: ——Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my Name* (calling on my Name) *he will give it you*. Elsewhere he saith, *I will give it you*; meaning, by his Intercession with God. 'Tis plainly as much as to say; Hitherto you have asked many things of me, because I am present with you to intercede for you; but the time is coming, when ye can ask me nothing, because I shall be taken from you; but be comforted, and ask immediately of the Father, calling on my Name, he will give you whatsoever

you

you shall ask, if it be good for you. Thirdly; To make Christ himself the Object to which we pray, is to destroy his *Mediatory Office*: For if he hears our Prayers, and both *can* and *doth* (by a Power constantly vested in him, as *Socinus* supposes) relieve our Wants; to what purpose is he appointed to be our Advocate and Intercessor with God?

How unlike, and utterly inconsistent, are these two Sayings; this of *Socinus*, We may and ought to pray to the Lord Christ as He who can himself help us; and this (contrary) saying of the Apostle, *He* (Christ) *is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him*, (*i. e.* that pray to God, calling on his Name, or for his sake) *seeing He ever liveth to make Intercession for them.* What can be more evident, than that here Christ's saving us from the Evils, which we either fear or labour under, is ascribed not to his own Inherent Power, but to the Power of his Intercession or Mediation with God? Which Mediation is not to be understood of a *Verbal* or *Personal* Mediation, proceeding from a particular knowledg of our Wants or Prayers; but of a general Mediation for All, *by his Merits*; that is, by the perfect Obedience, and most acceptable Services that he has performed to God.

The truth is, *Socinus*, and the Socinians properly so called, do not own *the Mediatory Office of Christ*: But they make him to be a Mediator, not that He intercedes for us, but because He is *Medius inter Deum & Homines, between God and Man*; being vested with a Power from God, to bestow on the Faithful, all necessary and convenient Things; in a word, He is not an *Intercessor* for Us, but a *King* to protect and help us.

Thus *Volkelius* (as he has been published, perhaps corrected, by *Crellius*) saith, *Etiam si nunc*, &c. *i. e.* "Although Christ did "now pray for us, *which yet we do not grant*, "it will not follow that He himself may "not be prayed unto; for nothing hinders, "but that he who prays to another, may "also be prayed to. *De vera Relig. Lib.* 5. *c.* 30. *p.* 518.

For my own part, I do not affirm any thing upon this Question; but I have mentioned these Arguments and Replies, that it may appear, that if our present Opposer (*Mr. Milb.*) does indeed say true, *that Person must needs be God, who may be prayed unto*; yet it will not follow, *therefore the Lord Christ is God*; because it cannot be *demonstratively* proved, that there is any real Scripture-ground for praying unto him.

But he will still urge, that at least those Unitarians who contend for the Invocation of the Lord Christ, are within danger and reach of his Objection; even this, that they must ascribe to Christ an Omniscience, Omnipotence, and Omnipresence; which are the very Attributes, the *essential* Attributes of the One true God.

I do not think this is a necessary Consequence; they do not make *another God* by their praying to the Lord Christ: it doth not follow, that He is Omnipresent, Omniscient and Omnipotent, because 'tis supposed and held, that He may be prayed unto, and also can supply all our Wants.

First, For Omniscience: 'Tis the General Opinion of all Sects and Parties of Christians, that the glorified Saints have more than a *Prophetick Knowledg*, by that which the Schools have called *the Beatifick Vision*; or, as the Apostle speaks, *by seeing God as he is*. The Benefit of *the Beatifick Vision*, shall be to Persons, in proportion to their Labour of Duty and Love, which they have showed to the Service of God: Therefore our Lord Christ in his present Glorified State, may have such a perfect *sight* of God, as to see in him, the Desires and Prayers, the Distresses, Defects and Perfections of such as call upon God in his Name. The Fathers and Schools do suppose, that the Saints in Heaven know very many things, both past and to come, by the Beatifick *Vision*; and that the Conversation in Heaven is not by *Speech* or Words, but by *Intuition* or Vision, or some the like way: 'Tis not therefore irrational,

rational, or bordering on *Idolatry*, or on *Polytheism*; if we suppose, that by the same Beatifick Vision, our Prayers are known to the Lord Christ, especially considering, that He is the *Appointed* Mediator for us.

Next for Omnipotence and Omnipresence; the Lord Christ may be able to succour us in Wants, both Temporal and Spiritual, without our supposing either that He is Omnipresent or Omnipotent: For the Omnipotence of God can confer even *on things Insensible*, a miraculous Power; nay such a Power as can effect Miracles at the greatest distance. Thus the Bones of the Prophet had Power to restore a dead Man to Life; The Brazen Serpent healed such as did but look toward it from *a distant* Place. But if such Virtue as this could be given to *inanimate* Things; the Divine Wisdom may have *Reasons*, and the Divine Omnipotence has an *Ability* to enable the Lord Christ to do Miracles, *as far as from Heaven to Earth*; and such Miracles too, as reach the *Minds* as well as the *Bodies* of Men.

We know not the Philosophy, or the Manner of the thing: but as 'tis (undeniable) not impossible; so 'tis an Hypothesis more *rational*, and infinitely more *safe* and *pious*, than to multiply *Gods*; or what is the same thing, (only in other words) *Divine Persons*, as our Trinitarian Opposers do.

I shall only add farther, upon this Subject of the Invocation of Christ; that whereas 'tis a Question, that has very much divided the Unitarians, *Whether the Lord Christ may be prayed unto?* There is no cause why they should not bear with one another, notwithstanding their dissent about this Question. For we have seen, that He may be the Object of Prayer, without making him *God*, or a Person of God; and without ascribing to him the Properties of the Divine Nature, Omnipresence, Omniscience and Omnipotence. Nor (on the other hand) do such as refuse to pray to any but God, dishonour the Lord Christ; even tho it be supposed that He may be prayed to; because in refusing to pray to him, they only refuse what they suppose that He himself hath forbidden; which maketh their Error, if it be an Error, to be *pure* and *mere Error*, not Malice, not Neglect or Contempt, which are *the only things that are punishable by a just Judge*, whether such Judge be God or a Man. Which one thing, were it but *considered* (as, I think, 'tis *enough*) by such as are Legislators, or Judges; the Account they must give at last to God, would be much more comfortable and tolerable for them, than now it is like to be.

Of the Adoration, or Worship of Christ.

That our Lord Christ is to be *worshipped*, was never made a Question by the Unitarians; we doubt not, that the Angels of Heaven do worship him: the Question is concerning *the kind* or *sort* of Worship. Trinitarians say, He is to be worshipped as God: we say, He is to be worshipp'd, as one (that I may use the Apostle's words) *whom God hath exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour*; or as another Apostle speaks, as one *whom God hath given to be Head over all things to the Church*, Acts 5. 31. Ephes. 1. 22.

There are three sorts of Worship; the first is *Civil Honour or Worship*; which is given to Others on account of Civil Dignity, or Natural Endowments, or the worthiness of the Rational Nature common to us all. This kind of Worship is due more especially from Inferiors to Superiors; but is not to be neglected by Superiors to Inferiors. Next there is *Religious Worship*, which we give to others on account of their Holiness, or of their Relation to God: And 'tis more or less, as their Sanctity or their Relation to God is greater or less; this sort of Worship is due to holy Men and Women, to the Ministers of God and holy Things, more yet to Prophets, above them to glorified Spirits and Angels. We see in the Bible, that *Religious Worship* was express'd by Terms of great defe-

nence and respect; such as *My Father*, and *My Lord*; and for outward Acts, sometimes by Kneeling, sometimes by Prostration, sometimes other ways; as on the other hand, they were sometimes accepted, sometimes refused. *Lastly*, There is *Divine Worship*, which belongs only to God. It consists in a Resignation of our Understandings to what God shall say or reveal; a Resignation of our Wills and Desires to what he does or decrees; 'tis a giving up our Affections to love him more than all things besides: It consists moreover in such external Acts and Significations of Reverence and of Love towards him, as we reserve only for him, and never give to any other.

I say now, the Texts cited and urged by our Opposer, do not prove, that the Lord Christ ought to be worshipp'd with more than a *Civil* and *Religious* Worship: there are no Acts of Worship ever required to be paid to him, but such as may be paid to a *Civil* Power, to a Person in high Dignity and Office, or to Prophets and holy Men, or to such as are actually possest of the Heavenly Beatitudes. What if it is said the Apostles *worshipped* (that is, kneeled to) him, *Mat.* 28. 17. and that to him every Knee both in Heaven and Earth *shall bow*? *Phil.* 2. 11. Let our Opposers show that the Apostles worshipped him, not as their *Master*, but as their *God*; or that every Knee is to bow to him, not as to a Superiour Lord, but as to a Person who is true and most High God: till they prove this, they prove nothing to the present purpose. We are well assured that we can prove the contrary; because we can prove the Lord Christ was a *Man*, a Person who for his holy Life and Death was *exalted by God*, which is inconsistent with his being God, or a Person of God; and whatsoever *Name* he hath, that Name was *given to him* by God; and whatsoever *Worship* is paid to him, is paid to him *for the Sake*, *by the Command*, and *to the Glory* (that I may use St. *Paul's* words) *of God, the Father of all*; Phil. 2. 11.

CHAP. XI.

Of the Satisfaction.

After having proved, as he thinks, the Divinity of our Saviour, our Author undertakes to prove too the vulgar Doctrine of *the Satisfaction*. He saith, *P.* 683, 684. The Infinite Justice of God *necessarily* requires, that every *Sinner*, nay, that every *Transgression* be punish'd. Therefore, saith he farther, that Mankind is pardoned, is *an Effect of the Justice of God*; to which Justice a full Satisfaction being paid, by the Sufferings of the Lord Christ in our stead; God could not evidence his Justice otherways than by granting Pardon and Salvation to us. If God could pardon us freely, without a Satisfaction to his Justice, why are not the fallen Angels pardoned?

At *P.* 706. he has contrived a Tale, or Romance, concerning a certain King, who taking Pity of his Rebels, declared that they should be pardoned, if any Person would be so kind to them, as to suffer in their stead: He tells us, the King's only Son offered to suffer for them; and his Offer being accepted by his Father, *who dearly loved him*, the Son died, and the Rebels were saved. And this, he saith, is exactly our case with God.

He

He pretends also to answer to some Objections made by the Socinians, against *the* (pretended) *Satisfaction to God's Justice by the Lord Christ for our Sins.* They object, that the Doctrine of a full Satisfaction to God's Justice on our behalf, destroys the *free Grace* of God (so much magnified in holy Scripture) in the *gratuitous* Pardon of our Sins: for if God received an *Equivalent* on our behalf, he hath not *pardoned* us, but only discharged or acquitted us, because our Debt to his Justice has been paid for us by another. To this he answers, Yes, the Grace and Pardon of God to us was most free: because tho our Debt to God's Justice has been paid, yet *not by us*, but by a Person whom God himself found out for us. Besides, the Satisfaction made for us by the Sufferings of the Lord Christ, being *a refusable Payment*, because God might have required the Satisfaction of our selves, or *from us*; therefore he is rightly said to have *pardoned* us, and to have shown most *free* Grace and Favour to us, even tho an Equivalent, and Satisfaction was made to his Justice on our behalf.

Again; They object, that God could not in Justice substitute a most *worthy* and *righteous* Person to undergo *Punishment*, properly so called, in the place and stead of *wrighteous* and *worthless* Persons; *that* were to pervert the Nature and whole Design of that sort of Justice which is exercised about Rewards and Punishments. He answers, God might punish the Lord Christ for us; First, Because under *the Law* the *innocent* Beast was substituted to Death and Punishment, by being made a Sacrifice for the Sin, and instead of the offending Owner and Master: *then*, because the Lord Christ freely offered himself to suffer in our room and stead.

Farther, they object, that the *three days Death* of the Lord Christ cannot be *equivalent*, and therefore not a Satisfaction to the Justice of God for *the eternal Death* and *Damnation* of one Sinner, much less of all Mankind. For, supposing that the Value of Sufferings or Punishment is increased even to Infinity, by the infinite Dignity of the Person that suffers; and supposing again, that the Lord Christ being God as well as Man, was indeed a Person of Infinite Dignity; yet seeing his Divinity could suffer nothing at all, but only his Humanity; therefore *his Sufferings were but human and finite*, and consequently no way commensurate to the *infinite* Punishment due to *one* Sinner, much less to that of *all* Sinners. He replies, *First*, that to the account of the Sufferings or Punishment of the Lord Christ, we must reckon all the Sufferings of his Life, and especially his Agony in the Garden; which (our Author saith) was so great, that it was equivalent to that eternal Punishment prepared by God for all impenitent Sinners, *p.* 749.

But lest the Agony in the Garden and on the Cross, should seem to any, to have been too much short in time, to be laid in the Ballance against the eternal Damnation of all Mankind: Therefore he subjoins, 2. As our Sins are made infinite, by their being committed against the Infinite Majesty of God: So the Satisfaction of the Lord Christ for us by his Death and other Punishments was also Infinite, *on the account of God's Greatness to which that Satisfaction was made*, p. 662. That is, the Punishment of the Lord Christ was Infinite, because he offered it to an Infinite God. He adds in the same place, God would never have accepted the Sufferings of the Lord Christ instead of ours, if he had not certainly known, that they were equivalent to the Punishments due to us for Sin. 3. The Person that suffered for us was both God and Man, and thereby his Sufferings were of an Infinite Value, and so equivalent to the Infinite Punishment due to us: for *tho the true God could neither die nor suffer; yet he who was true God did both suffer and die*, p. 663.

And because he understands not the true state of the Question and Difference between the Unitarians and the Church, concerning the Satisfaction by our Saviour; he hath objected to us a great number of

Texts, which are no way contrary to our Doctrine. He tells us from holy Scripture, that the Lord Christ was *wounded for our Transgressions, was bruised for our Iniquities*; that *we are healed by his Stripes*; that *God hath laid on him the Iniquity of us all*; that *he made his Soul an Offering for Sin*; that *he was delivered for our Offences*; that *he bore our Sins in his own Body on the Tree*, or Cross. To these he adds, Rom. 3. 24. *Being justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation for our Sins*; —— *to declare his* (God's) *Righteousness, that he may be just, and the Justifier of him that believeth on Jesus.*

This, Sir, is the Sum and Force of what our Author hath discourse at large concerning *the Satisfaction*. He is so well assured of the Truth of his Doctrine, that he ends his Book with twice imprecating on himself a Curse, if he shall ever write or teach other ways than he has taught his Reader in this present Book.

I will take a short view of all that he hath said.

He saith, first; The Infinite Justice of God requires, that every Sinner, nay, that every Transgression be punished; and that when God *pardons* and *saves* Sinners, this is *an Act of his Justice*; to which Justice a full Satisfaction having been paid by the Lord Christ, God cannot be just other ways than by pardoning and saving us. And if God can pardon without a Satisfaction to his Justice, why are not the Devils forgiven?

This was argued like a *Writer* in these Questions: the more Learned of his own Party know that the Cause is lost, if in the Question of the Satisfaction, Almighty God be not considered *as a Governour*, who indeed *can* forgive the Offenders, but for *Prudential* Reasons he *will not* forgive without a Satisfaction to his Honour and Justice.

Our Author stands in it, that God cannot forgive any Offender, or Offence, without Satisfaction by the Offender himself, or another in his stead. Why, what is the reason that the King and Proprietor of the whole World cannot forgive? He answers, *'Tis contrary to his Justice.* But is it contrary to Justice to show Mercy, or to remit of my own Rights and Dues? Am I unjust if I do not exact the *whole* of what is due to me? I may certainly do what I will with my own, else 'tis not *truly* and *wholly* my own. He that cannot *forgive*, neither can he *give*; for Forgiveness is nothing else, but *giving my Right* (to Debt or Punishment) to the Person who is indebted, or has offended me. 'Tis contrary (he saith) to the Justice of God, to forgive either the Transgression, or the Transgressor: but if it be contrary to Justice, 'tis *essentially and morally evil*: I ask therefore, How can God command us to forgive to one another our Transgressions and Offences? Can God command us what is morally and essentially evil, or what is contrary to the eternal Laws of Justice, by which he himself is obliged? O marvellous Scheme of Justice! 'tis contrary (they say) to Justice, to pardon without a full Satisfaction; but not contrary to Justice to lay my Guilt, and the Punishment due to it, on a Person *wholly* innocent and *perfectly* righteous: 'tis unjust to *forgive* the *real* Offender, or to *share* of the Punishment due to him; but not unjust to substitute a *well-deserving* Person to the Punishment that belonged to the other. In a word, *to show Mercy* by pardoning Offences is Injustice; but to *misplace Punishment* is none at all, but worthy of the Holiness and of the Wisdom of God.

But he saith, if God can forgive without an Equivalent, or Satisfaction to his Justice by the Offender, or another for him, why are not the Devils forgiven? And I ask, seeing an infinite Satisfaction hath been made in the Opinion of our Author and his Party, for Sinners, why are not the Devils comprehended in it? The same Infinite Satisfaction which our Opposers teach, was abundandy enough for the fallen Angels as well as for Men: let them tell us, how so much precious *Aurii* comes to be lost? This

Question

Question can never be answered on the Hypothesis of our Opposers; but on the Unitarian Hypothesis there is no difficulty at all in the case of the fallen Angels; for we answer, they are not forgiven, *because they repent not, nor amend.* Almighty God, as King and Proprietor of all Persons and Things, can forgive any Offence, or all Offences, even without Repentance or Amendment; nor is it contrary to his Justice so to do: but 'tis inconsistent with his Wisdom, because to forgive without Repentance or Amendment, is to incourage Sin and Disorder in the World: 'Tis also contrary to the Holiness of God, that the Incorrigible and Impenitent should escape unpunish'd. Our Opposers mistake too in thinking that 'tis the Justice of God by which he is prompted to punish Sinners; 'tis his Holiness and Wisdom: Justice has no other share or interest in Punishment, but only to see that Punishment be *not misplaced*, and that it do *not exceed the Offence.*

As to his Tale about the (mad) old King, and his (foolish) Son, 'tis perfectly ridiculous. He hath imagined, a King that promises to pardon his Rebels, if any other will be so kind as to suffer for them. 'Tis a *mad* Proposition, in the highest degree unreasonable and unjust; because if it was necessary that their Offences should be punish'd; Justice and Reason require, that the Offenders themselves, and not an innocent Person or Persons should suffer. Well, but as mad as the old King was, his Son was as foolish; for (our Author assures us) the Son offered to save the Rebels by dying in their stead: nor did the Folly of the Father and the Son stop here; for when the Father heard his Son say that he would die for the Rebels, he approved his Son's Extravagance, put his Son to Death, and pardoned his Rebels. Nor does our Author forbear to publish his own proper Folly, by telling us, that the old King *dearly loved his Son*, tho he put him to Death *for other Mens Faults*: He adds, that *this is our very case*, with respect to God Almighty and the Lord Christ. 'Tis so, I acknowledg, in the Hypothesis of our Opposers; but let them see to it, whether they do not expose themselves to just Scorn; while they can no ways defend their Hypothesis of the Satisfaction, but by comparing Almighty God and our Lord Christ to two such Prodigies of Folly, as never *really* were (or could be) *in Nature*, but only in the *Fiction* and *Fancy* of the Poetaster of *Yarmouth.*

I demand, would our Poet himself, as odd-conceited as he is, put his Son to death, or consent that he should be put to Death, to save his Maligners and Adversaries from a Punishment highly due to their Crimes? He hath been a great Enemy in his time to Rebellion, and at this day is writing Books against Rebels who are dead forty Years ago: Would he give one of his Children to Death, to save any of the surviving Rebels, as suppose Friend *Ludlow*? If he is neither so silly, nor so wicked to his Child, how has he dared to say, this is our case with respect to Almighty God and the Lord Christ? Why did not the Comparison and Instance that he himself devised, open his Eyes to discern the Folly and inconsistency of his Doctrine?

The Socinians object to their Opposers in these Questions, That if *an Equivalent* (which Trinitarians call a *Satisfaction*) has been given to God's Justice, on our behalf, by the Sufferings of the Lord Christ, then God hath not truly *pardoned* us, which the Scriptures every where affirm, but only *discharged* and *acquitted* us, because (our Debt being paid) he could do no less.

Our Author answers; Tho God's Justice has been satisfied, yet it was God who found out the Person, who was able and willing to pay our Debt: Besides, tho Sufferings of our Lord Christ, tho they were *equivalent* to the Punishment due to Sinners, were *a wholable Payment*; for God might have required, that the Sinners should suffer in their own Persons, not in the Person of a Redeemer, Mediator or Undertaker.

I will be so liberal, as to grant to our Author both these Answers; but I must insist upon it, that they are no Answers to the Objection proposed. For God doth not pardon his Debt or Offence, because he finds out a third Person that will pay or suffer for the Debtor or Offender; these two differ just as much as Payment and Forgiveness; that is to say, they are Contraries. But our Author adds, the Sufferings of the Lord Christ were *a refusable Payment*: 'tis well, but he saith, they were *an equivalent Payment*; how then can God be said to *pardon* us? doth *He* forgive who receives *an Equivalent* to the Debt due to him? Yes, he saith, it is Forgiveness *with respect to us*, for we have paid nothing, whatever our Friend, whom God found out, hath paid for us. But why doth he not consider that the Scriptures not only say, that *Sinners are pardoned*, but they say, *God hath pardoned them*? You may call their *Discharge a Pardon*, with respect to them; but you can never say, *God hath pardoned them*, if they are only *discharged* upon *an Equivalent* given for them, or paid by another on their behalf. To say, God hath pardoned us, supposes that he has received no Equivalent on our behalf; for if he had, however *we might be said to be pardoned*, yet it could not be said that *God pardoned us*; for the Pardon must (in that case) be imputed to the Person or Persons, who made the Satisfaction or the Equivalent, not to God. To avoid this, our Opposers say, he that made the Satisfaction, was God: the Son of God, who is also himself true God, that very true God to whom the Satisfaction was made, he made for us the Satisfaction. But this is *Jargon*, and we expected Reason from them: The one true God, they say, made for us the Satisfaction to the one true God; we deny that 'tis *Sense*, or *intelligible*. There is but one true God, and he is to *receive the Satisfaction* for our Sins against his Infinite Majesty, and not to *give Satisfaction*: How then can they say, but that they are accustomed to say any thing, the one true God made for us the Satisfaction? And if it could be true what they say, that God himself paid for us the Equivalent or Satisfaction; this is indeed no other but *forgiving us without a Satisfaction*, which is the very thing they deny: For if I pay to my self the Debt of my Debtor, or undergo the Punishment of my Offender; this is but *a mock-Satisfaction*, and I indeed *forgive him without a Satisfaction*. Which is so plain, that I wonder that so many Learned Persons as have written on the one and the other side of this Question, have not observed it.

Another Objection of the Socinians against the (pretended) *Satisfaction*, is; God could not (justly or wisely) substitute an innocent and well-deserving Person, to undergo Punishment, *properly* so called, in the place and stead of the Unrighteous and Worthless; because 'tis of the Nature of Justice, not to misplace Punishment. Our Author's Answers are; The *Innocent* Beast was sacrificed for the Sin of the Owner; and the Lord Christ *freely offer'd himself*, to suffer for us, though we were Worthless and Wicked.

His instance of Beasts offer'd in Sacrifice, on occasion of the Sin of their Owners, is not a whit to the purpose; for the Owners having an *absolute* Dominion over, and a *compleat* Right to the Service, Use, and very *Life* of their Beasts; therefore it was no Unjustice, when the Life of the Beast was given for the Offence of the Master or Owner. The Owner might kill his Beast for Food; therefore much more might he offer him to God, in lieu and exchange of his own Life, forfeited to God by Sin. And in this case, the *Worthless* was offer'd to the Mercy and gracious Acceptance of God, for the *Worthy*: so that there was no Offence committed, either against *Justice* or *Wisdom*. But all things are contrary, in the Lord Christ and Us, especially in the Hypothesis of our Opposers; for he was a Person, according to them, of *Infinite* Dignity and Merit; and we had no *right* in him, or *dominion* over

ver him, as the Sacrificer had over his Beast, that we should offer his Life or his Sufferings to God instead of our own.

As to that, the Lord Christ *freely offer'd himself for Us*, to undergo *Punishment* due to us: Neither could he do it, nor could God accept of it or allow it. An Innocent and Righteous Person may not, an Holy and Just Judg must not pervert the due Course of Justice. A just Governor may pardon Offenders, of his Mercy, but he cannot inflict their Punishment on the Innocent and Righteous; for 'tis of the very Essence of Justice, nay, is the first thing belonging to Justice, not to misplace Punishment. Not to misplace Punishment, and not to exceed the desert of the Offence, are the two things that constitute the Nature of *Punitive* Justice.

The last Objection, of which our Author thinks fit to take notice, is this; That the Three-days Death, and other Sufferings of the Lord Christ, could not be equivalent to the Eternal Damnation of so much as one Man, much less of all Mankind. He answers *three* ways.

1. Our Saviour's *Agony* in the Garden was, without doubt, such a weight of Sorrow and Pain, as was *equivalent* even to the *eternal* Damnation of *all* Men; else we must say, He was far less valiant in suffering, than many Martyrs have been; nay, was a very Dastard and Coward. Our Author pursues this Calumny upon his Saviour in several Pages; see, (Reader) from *p.* 739, to *p.* 749.

He makes *Calanus* the Indian (not a Christian neither, but an Heathen) a very *Heroe*, in comparison of that poor dispirited pretender Jesus of *Nazareth*. He hath this Passage, at *p.* 739. "Nothing seems more "*mean*, among the various Accounts of "Sufferers for Truth, than the Carriage "of our Saviour. He saith farther, That our Saviour prayed most earnestly to be delivered from Death; and that he sweat Drops, like Drops of Blood; but the Martyrs even offer'd themselves to the most cruel Deaths, and *sang* in the midst of Torments.

It is true, that the great Passion of our Saviour in the Garden, has made many to think, not without cause, that it proceeded from some higher Reason, than the apprehension of the Death of the Cross, which He was shortly to undergo. It may be (very probably) supposed, that He conflicted *then* with great Temptations; that the Devil was very busy to fill his Mind with *horrid* Idea's and Representations; and that this was the Cause of his *Agony*, and that *an Angel was sent to strengthen him*. The Martyrs (on the contrary) had Influences and Assistances from the Divine Spirit; and the Tempter was with-held from venting his Malice on them.

But to suppose, with our present Author, that our Saviour underwent (in the Garden) the very Torments of Hell; nay, such Torments as are infinitely greater than Hell-Torments; because they were equivalent to *the eternal* Torments of *all* the Damned; this is said without any ground, nay, contrary to all good Reason. We must suppose, on our Author's Hypothesis, First, That Christ underwent in the space of an hour, such an acute Pain, as answers fully to the whole Pain of a Damned Person in all *Eternity*. Secondly, That this Pain was so multiplied, as to be equal to *all* the Tortures of *all* the Damned in *whole* Eternity: And yet, Thirdly, he was only *exceeding sorrowful*, and had a very great *Sweat*. Surely such a Pain would have made him to *cry out*, much more earnestly than on the Cross; and how could an Angel *strengthen him* under such a Pain, of which no Angel in Heaven could himself have bore the *thousandth* part?

But I would know too, why an Angel from Heaven should be sent to *strengthen him*, as is expresly said at *Luke* 22.43? Why not rather the Divine Person, which (our Opposers say) was in him, and with which he was personally united, and personally one? It had been far more natural, that his

his own Divinity should have *strengthned* his Humanity, than that the Angel shall be sent to support *that* Man, who was (they say) God-Man. I know not what Relishes other Mens Understandings may have, but it will never go down with me, that *God-Man* could want to be strengthned by an *Angel*; and I look upon this to be an unanswerable Argument, that our Lord Christ was only a Prophet, and not God, or any such super-eminent Spirit, as the Arians believe him to be.

But that our Saviour's Sufferings may not want *Weight*, to be laid in the Ballance against *all* the Sufferings of *all* the Damned, our Author saith, 2. As the Guilt and Demerit of Sin is made Infinite, by being committed against the Infinite Majesty of God; so the Merit of Christ's Sufferings on our behalf becomes Infinite too, by being offered to an Infinite God.

I confess, when I read this, and his Story of the old King and his Son, I gave our Author over: for there never was any Man so silly but this Author, as to conceit, that a thing is made better or greater by the Greatness or Excellence of the Person to whom 'tis offered; tho it be true that an Offence may be the greater, for some Qualifications of the Person against whom it is done.

If what he says were true, that the Infiniteness of God makes that Suffering which is presented to him to be also Infinite; what needed our Saviour to have undergone so much as our Author conceits; the Pain of the Cross; nay, the least Pain in his Finger had been sufficient, without the *horrible* Agony in the Garden, which he supposes to have been equal to *all* the Pains of *all* the Damned, and that for ever. And if it be true, that Christ's Sufferings are made Infinite, by *his* Infinity to whom they are offered, then so also would the Sufferings of any other Man. This strange reasoning of our Author, makes the Punishment of Christ to be wholly needless; the Sinners themselves might have *fully satisfied God's Justice*, and that too by *the slightest* Sufferings, if suffering receives its nature and degree from the Infinity of that Majesty to whom 'tis tendred.

He saith, thirdly, He that suffered for us was God and Man in one Person; and tho ('tis true) *the true God could not die or suffer; yet He who was true God, did both suffer and die.* The Sufferings of such a Person must needs be esteemed of *Infinite Value*, tho they were not Infinite in their *Intensiue*, or in their *Duration*.

I think this to be almost as weak as the former Answer. For seeing they dare not pretend, that *God* could suffer any thing, but only *the Humanity*, which (They say) was united to him; such Sufferings were but *Human Sufferings*, the Sufferings of a Man, not of God, and therefore in no sense *Infinite*. Their Conceit, that *the Humanity* of Christ is united to *the Divine Person* of the Son, helps them not in this case; for God dwells in all the Faithful, nay, is *united* to them, and *one with them*; they are so *joined* (that I may use the Apostle's words) *to the Lord, as to be one Spirit with him*, 1 Cor. 6.17. John 17. 21. but neither their *Righteousness*, nor their *Sufferings* have any more value on that account, but are rated only according to their intrinsick, proper and real Worth.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

On the Texts *alledged for* the Satisfaction; *with a* Conclusion *of the whole.*

THE last thing we are to consider, is the Collection of Texts that our Author has here made; he urges, First, That *He* (Christ) *was wounded for our Transgressions, was bruised for our Iniquities*; that *we are healed by his Stripes*; that *God hath laid on him the Iniquity of us all*; that *He hath made his Soul an Offering for Sin.* All this is taken out of the 53d Chapter of *Isaiah*, which Chapter is by *some* taken to be a Prophecy, concerning the Prophet *Jeremiah*; by *others*, concerning the Messiah, or Christ. I do not think it to be any Prophecy at all, except in some few Passages of it; but especially not a Prophecy concerning a Person who was *then* to be born: I conceive the words are to be understood of the Prophet *Isaiah* himself, who speaking of himself, modestly speaks in the third Person, and the sense begins at *ver.* 7. of the foregoing Chapter.

I wonder very much, that so many Learned Men as have commented on this Prophet, have not discerned that the whole Discourse perfectly sutes to the Prophet himself, and that he speaks of a Person *actually in being*, not of one who was yet to be born. But because it would take up a great deal of room to make a Paraphrase on the *two* Chapters, and to show *the Reason* of it; I will be content to set down the Explication by *Grotius* and *Socinus*, of the particular Expressions here objected by our Author. *Grotius* is of opinion, that from *ver.* 7. of the foregoing Chapter, *Isaiah* prophesies of the Sufferings of the Prophet *Jeremiah*; yet so, that the whole Prophecy, and all the Expressions of the 53d Chapter, had *a second Completion* in the Person, Actions and Sufferings of the Lord Christ: and therefore some of the Expressions, tho originally intended of *Jeremiah*, are by the Writers of the New Testament *accommodated* also, and applied to the Lord Christ. Let us see what he saith.

Isa. 53. 5. *He was wounded for our Transgressions, and was bruised for our Iniquities.* But in the Original 'tis, he *has* been wounded *by* our Wickedness, and bruised *by* our Iniquity; that is, we have wickedly and unjustly afflicted and persecuted him.

The Chastisement of our Peace was upon him; and by his Stripes we are healed. No, the Original saith, *The Reproofs of our Peace were with him*: that is, the Reproofs that would have made our Peace with God, if we had hearkned to them, were truly with this Prophet; he reproved us justly, and for our saving Good, if we would have hearkned: *and by those his Stripes we might have been healed, i. e.* by those sharp and home-Reproofs, by those *Stripes* of his Mouth, we might have been amended and reformed, and thereby reconciled to God, and healed.

Ver. 6. *All we, like Sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the Iniquity of us all.* In the Hebrew, the Lord hath *by* him *met with* the Iniquity of us all: *q. d.* hath reproved all our Wickedness by him.

Ver. 10. *When thou shalt make his Soul an Offering for Sin, he shall see his Seed, he shall prolong his days.* But in the Hebrew thus; *If he* (the Prophet) *shall submit his Soul to Punishment*, he shall see his Seed, and pro-

long his days; or, *Tho he submit his Soul to Punishment*, &c. Punishment, saith *Grotius* here, is *properly* for Sin; but the Hebrews (saith he) call all Affliction by or from others, tho unjust and undeserved, by the Name of Punishment.

But our Author objects again, that the Apostle saith, *Rom.* 4.25. *He* (Christ) *was delivered for our Offences.* And 1 Pet. 2. 24. *Who himself bore our Sins in his own Body on the Tree*, or Cross. Rom.3.24. *Him hath God set forth to be a Propitiation for our Sins, to declare his* (God's) *Righteousness.* Heb. 9. 26. *Now once in the end of the World he hath appeared, to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself.*

Therefore 'tis to be noted, that very few of those that have undertaken to write against us, have really understood what we affirm or deny, concerning *the Causes*, or *the Effects* of our Saviour's Death. They trouble themselves with citing a great many Texts to evince that 'twas for our Sins (*as one Cause*) that Christ died; that he was a Sacrifice and Oblation for the Sins of the World; that he was a Ransom, a Price of Redemption for us. We deny none of these things, taken in a sober and possible sense: the Question is only this, Whether the Lord Christ *offered himself* as *such* a Sacrifice, Oblation or Price as might be made *to the Justice of God*, by way of *Equivalent* for what we should have suffered; or was an Oblation and Application, as all former Sacrifices under the Law were, *to the Mercy of God*, by way of humble suit and deprecation? We affirm the latter of these, that the Lord Christ, *besides other Ends of his Death*, rendred himself (in the nature of a Sacrifice) on the Altar of the Cross, to the Mercy and Benignity of God, by way of Supplication; not to the Divine *Justice*, as an *Equivalent* for so great a Debt as the Eternal Punishment of all Mankind in Hell-Fire. We judg it better thus to speak, than as our Opposers do, because the Abolition of our Sins, and our Discharge from Punishment, is always in Holy Scripture attributed to the great Mercy and Goodness of God; 'tis called Pardon, Remission, Grace, Freeness of Grace, Riches of Grace; all which were false, if indeed the Lord Christ gave a just *Equivalent* (they say, *more than an Equivalent*) to God's Justice for us.

In a word, our Opposers and We *agree*, that the Lord Christ, *being to die upon other accounts*, did withal tender his Person in Quality of an Expiatory Sacrifice, for the Sins of Mankind; himself was the Offerer, and also the Victim, and his Cross the Altar; he was a Ransom, and a Price of Redemption for us: but in this we differ, Whether he was an *Adequate* Price, or a Sacrifice *to the Justice of God?* We cannot comprehend that *one* Man could be an *Equivalent* for *all* Men; or his *short* Sufferings *equal* to the *Eternal* Damnation of an Infinite Multitude; or that God can be said to *pardon*, if he hath been *over-paid* for our Debt to him: therefore we content ourselves to teach, that our Blessed Saviour being to confirm his Gospel by his Death, and to be *made perfect by Sufferings*, as the Author to the Hebrews speaks, did also offer himself as a Sacrifice, and as a sort of Ransom and Price for us, to *that* Mercy and Benignity of God, by which he was wont to accept the Oblation of Beasts, the Blood of Goats and Lambs, for his repenting and returning People. This Hypothesis leaves to God the intire Glory of forgiving us; to our Saviour, the Honour of being the Means, Motive and Procurer of our Pardon and Salvation; and fully answers all Scripture-Expressions concerning our Saviour's Death, objected to us by our Opposers in this Question. But *they* (our Opposers) after all their Subterfuges, are forced by their Hypothesis, to this *monstrous* Conclusion; that God *freely* pardoneth to Sinners their whole *Debt* of Sin and Punishment; and yet has been infinitely *over-paid* for both, in the Death and other Sufferings of the Lord Christ: than which, there can be no greater, or more apparent Contradiction.

As to our Author's Conclusion, that he wishes himself *accursed*, and *again accursed*, if ever

ever he deliver other Doctrine than what he hath defended in this Book: I shall only say this, that *as wise as he have lived to alter their Minds.* Nor can he defend his Rashness by the Example of the Apostle; for when St. *Paul* curses *himself* or any *other* for preaching or teaching otherways, he speaks not of doubtful and uncertain Questions; but *If we preach any other GOSPEL to you, let us be accursed*; *Gal:* 1. 8, 9. And the reason of our Apostle's Confidence was very different from our Author's: the latter grounds himself on a few ambiguous and uncertain Texts, capable of *contrary* Translations and Senses; and when taken in *his* Sense of them, are contrary to Reason and common Sense, and to the general Current of Holy Scripture: but the Apostle speaks of a matter which he had received by *express* Revelation from Jesus Christ, and even from God the Father of All.

FINIS.

BOOKS lately printed by the Socinians.

THE Brief History of the Unitarians, vulgarly called Socinians, in four Letters. The first Letter, besides the History of the Socinians, proves the Unity of God: the other three answer the (pretended) Proofs of the Doctrine of the Trinity. Second Edition.

The Acts of *Athanasius*, with *brief Notes on his Creed*, and Observations on Dr. *Sherlock's Vindication* of the Doctrine of the Trinity, opposed by him to the *Brief History* and *Brief Notes*.

Observations on Dr. *Wallis* his Letters, written in Vindication and Explication of the Athanasian Creed.

Some Thoughts on Dr. *Sherlock*'s Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

A Defence of the brief History, against the Vindication by Dr. *Sherlock*.

An Exhortation to a Free and Impartial Inquiry into the Doctrines of Religion.

A Letter of Resolution concerning the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation; giving the general Reasons of the Unitarians against those Doctrines.

Two Letters touching the Trinity and Incarnation; the first urges the Belief of the Athanasian Creed, the other is an Answer thereto.

An accurate Examination or Judgment on *the principal* Texts relating to the Questions concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, and his Satisfaction; occasioned by a Book of Mr. *L. Milbourn's*, called by him, *Mysteries* (in Religion) *vindicated*.

REFLECTIONS
ON
TWO DISCOURSES
CONCERNING
The Divinity of our Saviour:

Written by Monsieur LAMOTH in *French*, and done into English.

Written to *J. S.*

LONDON,
Printed in the Year MDCXCIII.

REFLECTIONS *on two Discourses concerning the Divinity of our Saviour*, &c.

AMong our other Opposers, we are at length attacked by the Preachers; and Monsieur *Lamoth*, an eminent Demagogue of the *French* Nation, hath published two of his late Declamations against us.

I know not whether he was chosen to, or put himself upon the Imployment; but I will allow, that a more fit Person cannot be readily found for the Work by him undertaken. He hath Art and Address enough; and such a Degree of Confidence, as to be above both *Shame* and *Fear*. If he had either of those, in any Degree, left to him, he would never have said as he does at *pag.* 15, 16, 17, 34. that *the Apostle* Paul *had not common Sense*, nor *any tolerable Degree of Understanding*, nay was *a Mad-man*, and the rest of *the Apostles were Blasphemers*; if we do not grant that the Doctrines of the Trinity and of the Divinity of our Saviour, as they are now held, are true. Concerning all the Writers of the New Testament, he pronounces at once, as here followeth; *I make no Difficulty* (saith he, *p.* 33.) *to assert, they have deceived us most shamefully, and their Writings are no better than continual Blasphemies, if Christ be not true God.* As to the Christian Religion, he saith at *p.* 18. *It hath nothing in it that is great and sublime, if you take from it the Divinity of Jesus Christ.*

'Tis not to be doubted, that in his next he will tell us, our Saviour himself was an Impostor, to speak of himself as he did, if he were the Great Prophet only. But in the mean time, I shall tell him, that 'tis ill manners, nay 'tis unchristian and impious, to set the Persons of the Apostles, and the Holy Scriptures themselves, on the same Level with the litigated controverted, (*and therefore*) *doubtful and uncertain Doctrines*, of this or the other Party of Christians; so that both must stand or fall together: for 'tis to equal in their Authority our private Interpretations of the Word, with the Word it self. The latter will have its true Value allowed to it, by all wise and good Men, while the other (private Interpretations or Opinions) shall even among *such*, undergo various Changes, be believed in some Ages, and rejected in others; which (all learned Men know) has been the Fortune of the Doctrines, in Debate between us and the Church.

But Monsieur *Lamoth* is heartily troubled; that, *if you take away the Divinity of our Saviour, we shall find our Religion to contain nothing that is* GREAT *or* SUBLIME, p. 18. The Socinians, on the contrary, judg, that the Design of Religion being (confessedly) this, *to direct our Conversation and Manners*, 'tis no Matter how plain and obvious it is; and that *it* being intended for the Unlearned and Vulgar, as well as for others, there was a Necessity, it should neither be *sublime* nor *great*. We are well satisfied with the Character that *Moses* and St. *Paul* give of Religion; *'Tis not in Heaven, or beyond the Sea, or in the Deep*, (as who should say, 'tis neither sublime nor mysterious) *but 'tis in thy Mouth and Heart, that thou mayst do it.* As if he had said, 'Tis an easy intelligible thing, congenite and connate to every Man; that none may say 'twas *sublime*, and he understood it not, 'twas *great*, and he could not grasp it. This is the Description that *Moses* makes of *true* Religion,

Deut. 30. 12. And St. *Paul* repeating his Words, applies them to the Gospel, *This is the Word of Faith* (says he) *that we preach*, Rom. 10. 8. But Mr. *Lamoth* and his Party are not for such a Religion, they must have a Religion that is *great and sublime*; and accordingly they have contrived to themselves such a Religion, a Religion of which they not only say, but profess and boast, that 'tis *above and beyond all Reason*.

You require of me, Sir, that I should examine the Defence that Monsieur *Lamoth* hath made of *the great and sublime* Religion; I will do so in the following Method:

1. I will make short Remarks on the General Arguments dispersed up and down in his *two Discourses*, as his Translator has complemented him, though he should have said his *two Declamations*.

2. I will give an Account of the Texts, which (whether they will or no) he hath impressed to serve his Cause.

On his general Arguments.

I Omit that he is pleased to call us, *p.* 52, 55, 62, 63. *Enemies of Jesus, the Profane, Innovators, Adversaries of the Lord Jesus, near Neighbours to Irreligion:* for these are Complements that some Preachers readily bestow on as many as differ from them. Though again, when he is in the Mood, (as at *p.* 62.) he confesses, that *we seem to be innocent Lambs:* and that in our Writings are found *glittering Notions, and ingenious Explications.* We won't thank him for the Acknowledgments which Truth itself has extorted from him; nor will I resent much his ill Language to us: but I will endeavour to treat him, though somewhat sharply, yet in a more Gentleman-like way.

He saith, *p.* 52, 53, 54. 'By denying the 'Divinity of our Saviour we make *the Bible* 'the *strangest Book in the World.*—The Old 'Testament will scarcely have the least A'greement with the New; we find *nothing but* 'Thwartings and Contradictions between them. '—This once supposed (*viz.* that Christ is 'not the most High God) 'tis evident, that 'Christ came not to fulfil the Law and Pro'phets, but *utterly to confound and destroy them.* 'Let us speak only of the New Testament: '—What a Book shall we have of it, if Je'sus Christ be not God?—The New Testa'ment is full of antient Oracles (*he meaneth* '*of Quotations out of the Old Testament*) to the 'Honour of the Living God: but 'tis as clear 'as the Noon-day, that the Applications 'that the Apostles make of them are *mere* 'childish Trifflings and Blasphemies, if our Savi'our by one of his Natures be not the Living 'God.

Afterwards, at *p.* 53, 54. he proceeds to tell us, how the Holy Ghost *ought* (saith he) *to have spoken*, if Jesus Christ be not God. For if he is God, the Holy Spirit (according to this Author) has been as faulty and as blasphemous as the very new Testament and the Apostles are. Let us hear what he saith; 'Why, say the Socinians, might not the Ho'ly Ghost speak magnificently of *that* Re'deemer, to whom we are so vastly obliged, 'and whom Providence has raised to such a 'Degree of Glory? For that Reason say I '(*I Monsieur* C. G. Lamoth) the Holy Ghost '*ought to have spoke with more Reservedness* of 'the Glory of Christ. The greater he is, the 'more is the Danger of his being taken for 'God; his very Greatness makes us the more 'stand in need of Preservatives.—If he had 'not been God, the Excess of our Obligati'ons to him *should have obliged the Holy Ghost* '*not to speak of him:* Or at least, seeing it was 'not possible to teach his Doctrine without 'speaking of his Person, to make use of such 'Expressions as might make it evident, that 'he is not God. It was necessary, in most 'express Terms, and on several Occasions, 'to tell Men, this Jesus, whom you worship, 'is not God for all that.—Neither can any 'thing be said in the Case, (*he meaneth*, that 'the Holy Ghost has not spoke as Mr. *Lamoth* 'here directs) but only this, that the Holy 'Ghost was willing to deceive us.

Hold,

Hold, *Jehu*; lest instead of hearing that *thou drivest furiously*; they call to thee, that thou drivest *madly*. Declamations did I call these Sermons; they are *Debacchations*: For I will affirm, that no Example or Instance can be given of a bold and heady Writer, who hitherto ever durst exalt his Opinion, or the Opinion of his Party, above the Apostles, the Scriptures, and the Holy Ghost it self; so that if the *former* were not allowed or supposed to be true, the *other* must be mere Blasphemies, Blasphemers and Fools.

If the hundred and fifty Sects, or more, into which Christianity is divided, should all fall to scribling, and should be as extravagant in their Imputations on the Bible, as this Frenchman has dared to be, what would become of the Christian Religion? It would be turned into Ridicule, by all that heard us, magnifying *so much* our own Glosses, Interpretations or Opinions, and regarding the Text it self, and the Authors of it *so little*.

Our present Author's Book is vouched or licensed by two French Ministers, who tell us, that being appointed by the rest of their Brethren to read it, they find it entirely conformable to the constant Doctrine of the French Protestants. I will not believe them, though they gave it upon Oath; for it never was the Doctrine of the French Protestants, nor of any Protestants, no nor of any Christian, that if their Creed be not true, the Apostles were *Mad-men*, the Scriptures *Blasphemies*, and the Holy Ghost knew not how *to speak as he ought*; which are Words often repeated by Mr. *Lamoth*.

But you will say, Sir, but Mr. *Lamoth* has perhaps some particular and especial Grounds for his unusual Confidence; he hath advanced something that is wholly new, and very forcible, in behalf of the Doctrines of the Trinity, and our Saviour's Divinity. Nothing less, I assure you; you may meet with *as much* in every Catechism, and with *much more* in every little System: I mean, setting aside his gaudy Flourishes and childish Exaggerations upon mere *Nothings*; his Exclamations, and other Schemes of *School-boys and Preachers Rhetoric*, with which the World has been so long tired, as to nauseate them. But this you will better see when we come to the Examination of his Texts.

2. To his own *ridiculous* Confidence of his Opinion, he adds as a farther Strength to it, some (impertinent) Quotations out of the *Fathers*, particularly from *Tertullian* and *Gregory*, surnamed *Thaumaturgus*. He says farther at *p.* 61. that the Doctrine he has asserted in these Sermons is *the Doctrine of the Primitive Church*. And at *p.* 162. that *Christians have been in possession of it above these sixteen Centuries*. I suspected all along what an observant Reader of Fathers and Church-History Mr. *Lamoth* is; but here he himself has shewed us, he considers not so much, as how many *Years* he is to reckon, from this present Year to our Saviour. Why, Man, the Socinians will give to thee and thy Fellow Tritheists the whole 16 Centuries which thou here insistest on, and are content with the *seventeenth*, of which (it should seem) thou knowest nothing. The Century of our Saviour and the Apostles, *the seventeenth* from us, is to us instead of all the rest; and in the Opinion of all true Protestants that alone is worth more than all the rest, if they were never so many Sixteens more. But we are ready to contest it in the Presence of all the learned World, from the (genuine) Writings of the Fathers before the *Nicene* Council, that the Doctrine of the present Church, of three *equal*, *consubstantial* and *co-eternal* Persons, now called *the Trinity*, was expressly rejected by them; that is to say, as consubstantial, co-eternal and co-equal, are now understood by the Church, and opposed by the Unitarians.

Trinitarians boast in vain of the (pretended) Consent of the antient Church with them, till they can answer the first Dissertation the τετραλογία or *Quaternio* of Dissertations, written by *S. Curcellæus* against *S. Maresius*, concerning the Judgment of the Fathers and the Primitive Church, in the Questions of the Divinity of our Saviour, the Words *Trinity*, *Consubstantial*, &c. Neither *Maresius*, though an able and learned Person, nor any

for him, have offered to reply; and the more learned of the Trinitarians, among the rest D. *Petavius*, and the learned and exact Dr. *Cudworth*, have owned the Dissent of the *ancient* Church from the *present*, about the Sense of the Words *Consubstantial*, *Co-eternal*, and *Co-equal*, in which the whole Controversy concerning the Trinity doth consist.

3. From *p.* 55 to *p.* 61. he considers the Difficulties advanced by the Socinians (or Unitarians) on behalf of the Unity of God, and against the (imagined) Divinity of our Saviour; he *learnedly* distinguishes them into Heart-Difficulties, Wit-Difficulties, and Scripture-Difficulties: *Heart-Difficulties* being a new sort of *Cant*, he explains by saying, *p.* 55, 56. that such is the Temper the Heart of Man hath received from the Impressions of Sin, that whatsoever comes from Heaven is suspected, though indeed there be no other Reason to suspect it, but that it comes from Heaven. And again, Heaven saith it, this is sufficient for Man to doubt, deny it, contradict it.

This is a *Slander upon humane Nature*; 'tis inconsistent with our rational Faculty or Power of Reasoning; and the Experience of Mankind contradicts it. For every Body knows that the general Fault of the World is not *Unbelief*, but *Inconsideration*, and an Omission or Neglect of Duty from a *vain* Hope and Expectance that we have yet time enough and to spare, in which to amend all Faults, and to make our Peace with Heaven. But if Mr. *Lamoth* is indeed acquainted with any, who therefore will not believe, because *Heaven* hath said it, as he affirms; my Advice to him is, to let those *resolute* People alone, for if they will not believe *Heaven*, they will much less believe *him*.

But as to all these Difficulties (the Heart-difficulties, Wit-difficulties, and Scripture-difficulties) which he hath pursued in divers Pages, he hath represented them so *meanly*, as well as answered them so *weakly*, that the Socinians own them not for theirs. We desire the Reader to inform himself of the *Difficulties* or Arguments advanced by the Socinians, not from Mr. *Lamoth*, but from our own Writings, that is to say, from the *Brief Notes on the Creed of* Athanasius; the first Letter in *the brief History of the Unitarians*; *the Letter of Resolution concerning the Trinity and Incarnation*; *the Trinitarian Scheme, with Notes thereupon*; *the Answers to Dr.* Sherlock, *Dr.* Wallis, *and Mr.* Milbourn. In which Pamphlets he will see enough to furnish him out against a much abler Sophister than Monsieur *Lamoth*.

His last General Argument against us is this, that we cannot endeavour the Propagation of our Opinions without troubling the Peace of Mens Consciences, and setting Christians together by the Ears. They own us, saith he, to be in a State of Salvation, and that we have retained *all the Fundamental and saving Points of Christianity*; where therefore is *the Charity* of these *rash* Persons, to shake a Doctrine which cannot be attacked with any Success, without filling the Consciences of Men with *Trouble*, and shedding whole *Torrents* of Christian Blood? Such a Design as this cannot be the Effect of any thing but *Pride*: they have a Mind to distinguish themselves by the Novelty of their Opinions, and to advance their own Glory, by abating that of Jesus Christ. This is the Sum of what he saith, *p.* 62, 63.

He is the unhappiest Man alive at arguing a Point, whether great or small. Let us suppose it to be as he says, that Trinitarians have retained *all the Fundamental Points of Christianity*; must we not therefore open our Mouths in Defence of so sacred a Truth as the Unity of God? The Papists have retained all the Fundamental Points of Christianity, in opinion of all Protestants but the Socinians; their Fault and Error is only this, that they have *added* abundance of *Wood*, *Hay and Stubble*, to the *Gold*, *Silver and precious Stones*: Shall I say hereupon with this Author, *where therefore was the Charity of those rash Persons*, the Authors of the French Reformation, *to fill the Consciences of Men with Trouble, and hazard the shedding* (nay actually to shed, as they did) *whole Torrents of Christian Blood?* He saith, *p.* 62.

No-

Nothing can warrant the Attempts of the Socinians, if the Doctrine which Trinitarians teach and believe is *consistent with Salvation*. Then say I, what shall excuse the first Reformers, *Luther* and *Calvin*, for Protestants believe Popery to be *consistent with Salvation?* and I do not think that this bold Man himself will say, all Papists are damned.

But I desire to know of him, why *Torrents of Christian Blood must be shed*, on Occasion of the Socinians *peaceable* Declaration of the Reasons which convince them of the Unity of God, and their modest Defence of themselves, from the Imputations of being *Innovators, Enemies of the Lord Jesus, near Neighbours to absolute Irreligion*; and such like barbarous and inhumane Scandals? He doth not think the Socinians will shed *his* Blood, or any Man's else. He owns, *p.* 62. that we (at least) seem to be *innocent Lambs*; nay our Principles and Carriage have wrested also this from him: I am willing (saith he) to believe, that they cherish nothing of the Spirit of Persecution. What Danger then is there, that Torrents of Christian Blood should be shed? The Truth is, were it not for *the Preachers*, there never had any Blood been shed, by occasion of the Questions and Disputes about Religion: Matters had been fairly *reasoned*, and we should have thank'd one another for the Light and Information we received from one another, were it not that the *Preachers* by their importune Clamours have always set one Part of the Christian Flock against the other: They have been nothing less, for the Generality of them, than their Office requires, even Preachers of mutual Candour, Charity, Forbearance, Love, ingenuous Freedom of Mind, against the unhappy Biasses of Education, Prepossession, Interest, and other Adversaries, to the Discovery of Truth, whether Religious or Philosophical.

It can be *nothing*, he saith, but our Pride, and a Desire to advance our own Glory by the Novelty of our Opinions, that occasions our Dissent from other Christians. Nay so wicked are we, as well as vain, that to exalt our selves we care not how we abuse Jesus Christ, whom we confess to be our Redeemer and Saviour: But Mr. *Lamoth* should have been very sure of it before he proclaimed to all People, that we honour our selves more than we honour Jesus Christ, nay to the Dishonour of Jesus Christ; and that our Bottom is nothing but *Pride*. 'Tis *nothing*, it should seem with him, that we have this Charge given to us in the very first Commandment, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me*; no other, whether they be *real* Persons, or only *imaginary* and *fictitious* ones. 'Tis *nothing* that our Saviour says to the young Man whom he loved, *Why callest thou me Good, there is none good save one, that is God.* Nothing that St. *Paul* tells all Christians; *there is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Jesus Christ.* Nothing that an Almighty Father, an Almighty Son, and an Almighty Spirit, different in Number from both, can no more be conceived to be one Almighty, than a mortal Father, a mortal Son, and a third Person who also is mortal, can be conceived to be but one Mortal, not three Mortals. If you require *Scripture*, we bring the *express* Words of our Saviour, at *John* 17. 3. *the Father* (saith he there) *is the only true God.* If you demand *Reason*, we demonstrate it with more than mathematical Certainty, that three *Divine* Persons must needs be three Gods, because *three Divine Persons* is nothing else but the Periphrasis or Circumlocution for *three Gods*, even as three *humane Persons* and three *angelical Persons* are the Circumlocutions or Periphrases for three *Men* and three *Angels*. Mr. *Lamoth*'s Answer is, that all this (and an hundred times more) is *nothing*. 'Tis true indeed, that the Sun cannot shine so brightly as to force it self to be seen; for after all, 'tis but shutting ones Eyes, and the Sun shines in vain.

He urges us with it, that we grant that Trinitarians have retained *all the Fundamental Articles of Religion*. Who grants it? First, they themselves own, that if they are mistaken, they are *Idolaters*; they are conscious, nay they profess and dispute for it, that they

are

are guilty of Polytheism, if there be no such Persons as they have imagined, even an *eternal* Son of God, and an Almighty and Living Spirit, different in Number from that Son, and from God the Father of all.

But the Socinians grant it: I cannot answer for every particular Writer of the Socinians; for my own part, I shall never grant that the Unity of God, or but one *Divine* Person, is not a Fundamental Article. My Reason is this; 'tis confessed on all sides, that both the Covenants (the Old as well as the New) is between the one true God, on the one part, and his Servant *Man* on the other: but if so, the Covenant is utterly dissolved on our Part, if besides this one true God with whom we are in Covenant, we set up, and equal also with him, another Person or Persons, whether *real* or *imaginary* ones: I mean such as knowingly do so, and worship accordingly. As the Covenant of Allegiance and Protection (Allegiance on the Part of the People, and Protection on the Part of the King) is broken on the Peoples Part, if they set up or own any other Person as King, besides him who of Right is so. But come we now to the true Strength of his Book, the Texts that he hath alledged.

On his first Proposition from the Words of his Text.

HE chooseth for his Subject or Text the Words of St. *Paul*, Phil. 6. 7. *Who being in the Form of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the Form of a Servant, and was made in the Likeness of Men.* He saith these Words present us with three Propositions.

1. That Jesus Christ *was* before he was in the Form of Man.

2. That he was *in the Form of God* before he was in the Form of Man.

3. That he thought it not Robbery to be equal with his heavenly Father.

The first of these, that Jesus *was* before he was in the Form of Man, he proveth thus: The Text says, that *being in the Form of God, he humbled himself*; or as 'tis in the Original, *he emptied himself*. But *what Sense* shall we make of the Words, saith he, if it be not true, that our Saviour before his Birth of the Blessed Virgin, was in a more glorious State than was that State upon which he entred at his Nativity?

'Tis an Impiety that runs through our Author's whole Book, that the Scriptures have not spoken Sense, if they do not always mean as he would have them. I pray, Sir, see the seventh Chapter of the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn*, and then tell me, whether the Socinians have not made Sense of St. *Paul*'s Words, without supposing (as Trinitarians here do) that *Paul* advanceth *another*, or a *second* God! It is shown there, that to be *in the Form of God*, is common to our Saviour with all other Men: all Men (say the Scriptures) are made in the Similitude, Form or Likeness of God, *Jam.* 3. 9. But our Blessed Saviour was more in the Form or Likeness of God than any other Man or Men, because he had a more perfect Holiness, and a miraculous Power and Authority over the Devils, Diseases, the Sea, the Winds, for the Confirmation of that Doctrine which he was to deliver to Men in the Name of God.

Our English Translation adds, *he thought it not Robbery to be equal with God.* But 'tis now known even to School-boys, that the Greek Words should have been rendred to a just contrary Purpose: their Lexicon upon the Greek Testament (made by the industrious and learned *G. Pasor*) teaches them to read here, *Non rapuit æqualitatem cum Deo*; he assumed not to himself to be equal with God. So that the Sense is, though the Lord Christ was in a greater Likeness to God than ever any other Creature was, yet he was far from imitating the Pride and Ambition of *Lucifer*, he took not on him to be equal with God; but on the contrary, he took on him the Form of a Servant, that is, to set us an Example of Humility and mutual Toleration, he submitted to Reproach, and even to Blows, with-

without reviling again, or other ways avenging himself on those that wronged him.

Every one knows what Great *Erasmus* hath said upon this Text, that though the Fathers were wont to urge it against the *Arians*, to prove that the Son is *God equal with the Father*; yet the Apostle, saith he, had no such Intention. Therefore he approveth the Explication of St. *Ambrose*, *Non defendit sibi æqualitatem*; Christ did not defend himself to be equal with God. *M. Luther*, the first Reformer (*lib. de duplici just.*) admonishes his Reader, that we must not understand this Text *affirmatively*, but *negatively*; not as saying that Christ made himself equal with God, but as denying that he is equal with God; which I mention only that the less learned Reader may know, that besides the Socinians, some of the principal Interpreters and Critics, among our Opposers themselves, have been aware, that this is not a Context to be insisted on, as a Proof of our Saviour's Divinity.

Our Translation goes on; and *took on him the Form of a Servant, and was made in the Likeness of Men*. I could never yet see any Greek Testament that so reads the Words; and I dare affirm that no Greek Copy, whether Printed or Manuscript, so reads. All the Original Copies (with one Consent) read thus; *But made himself of no Reputation, taking the Form of a Servant: being made in the Likeness of Men, and found in fashion as a Man*, (that is, being a Man like to all other Men; so the Trinitarian Interpreters themselves understand the Words) *he humbled himself, and became obedient to Death, even the Death of the Cross*; i.e. he submitted to the unjust Powers that then were, and chearfully underwent Death, even the painful and ignominious Death of the Cross. This, all learned Men know and own, is the true Reading of this Text; and it blows away at once all the little Devices that Monsieur *Lamoth* uses to pervert its plain and obvious meaning.

But in pursuance of this first Proposition from his Text, that Christ *was* before he *was made Man*, he urges divers other Texts, *nine* in all.

1. He saith, that Jesus Christ declares, that he *was come down from Heaven, and that he was in Heaven, before ever he ascended thither*. We answer, Mr. *Lamoth* makes use of a peculiar Bible of his own; he will never be able to show us such a Text in any Bible but that which is in his private Custody.

2. *John* the Baptist saith, *John* 1. 30. *After me cometh a Man who is preferred before me, for he was before me*. We answer with his learned Country-man *Th. Beza*, the Lord Christ was preferred before *John*, because though he was after *John* in *Time*, yet he *was before him in Merit and Dignity*.

3. But St. *Paul* says, 1 *Cor.* 10. 9. *Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them* (the Israelites in the Wilderness) *tempted, and were destroyed of Serpents*. This Text were indeed to the Purpose of our Saviour's Pre-existence, if it had been said here, that the Israelites in the Wilderness *tempted* (*i.e.* murmured against) *Christ*. But this is not said; and 'tis certain they tempted *God*, not the Lord Christ.

4. It is said of *Moses*, Heb. 11. 26. *He preferred the Reproach of Christ before the Treasures of Egypt*. We answer, with almost all the Commentators on the Scriptures; the Israelites were reproached by their Oppressors the Egyptians, with their Hopes of a Saviour, or Messias, or Christ; but *Moses* preferred this *Reproach*, as the Egyptians counted it, before all the Treasures of *Egypt*.

5. Our Saviour again saith, *John* 8. 58. *Before* Abraham *was I am*. It is to be understood as when 'tis said of the same our Lord Christ, *Rev.* 13. 8. *The Lamb who was slain from the Beginning of the World*. Christ *was*, and *was slain* before *Abraham*, and before the Foundation of the World, not actually, but *in the Ordination and Decree of God*. Accordingly St. *Peter* saith of him, 1 *Pet.* 1. 20. *Who verily was fore-ordained* (not only before *Abraham*, but) *before the Foundation of the World, but was manifest in these last Days*.

6. We are assured by St. *Peter*, 1 Pet. 3. 19. *Jesus Christ preached to the Spirits that were disobedient in the Time of* Noah. Here again he maketh use of his own private Bible; when

he puts the Text in the Words of the known and authentick Bibles, we will give him an Account of it. In the mean time he may see it explained, and the Explication warranted by the Authority of thirty Fathers, in the fourth Letter of the *Brief History of the Unitarians.*

7. 'Tis affirmed by the Evangelist *John*, ch. 1. 1. *In the Beginning was the WORD.* We answer, In the Beginning *of the Gospel-State Christ was.*

8. The same Evangelist saith, *John* 1. 3. *All things were made by him* (by the WORD) *and without him was not any thing made, that was made.* We grant it, in that Sense in which only 'tis consistent and reconcilable with those innumerable Texts which assure us, that only God was the Maker of the first or *old Creation.* But St. *John* speaks here of the new Creation, or the Gospel-Oeconomy and State, *that new Heavens and new Earth, wherein dwelleth Righteousness.* This Creation was begun by the Ministry, and perfected by the Directions of the Lord Christ; who hath *made all things new*, by abolishing Judaism and Paganism, Ceremony and Idolatry, and introducing in their room moral Righteousness, and the Knowledg of the one true God. All these (great) things *were made by him*, (or as the Original may be rendred, *done by him*) *and without him was nothing done that was done.* But of this I have spoken fully, and I hope satisfactorily and effectually, with respect to considering Men, at *Chap.* 3. of the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn.*

9. He finds too the Pre-eternity of our Saviour, even in the *Proverbs* of *Solomon*, who introduceth *Wisdom* as saying, *When there were no Depths,——before the Mountains were settled, before the Hills was I brought forth*, Prov. 8. 24, 25. It falls out here somewhat unluckily, for our Author, and such learned and judicious Interpreters as he is, that if this *Wisdom* must needs be (not a *Quality* or Property, but) a real and a divine *Person*, she was a *Goddess*, not a God. For 'tis undeniable that *Solomon* speaks of her as a *Female:* She begins her Discourse at the first Verse of this Chapter; *Doth not Wisdom cry, and Understanding lift up HER Voice? SHE standeth at the Top of the High Places;——SHE crieth at the Gates.*

On his second and third Propositions.

HIS second Proposition from his Text is, our Saviour *was in the Form of God before he was in the Form of a Servant:* which he taketh to be the same with this; he was in the Form of God *before he was Man.* He giveth two Reasons:

1. Because 'tis said here, *being in the Form of God, he emptied himself:* So he translates the Words instead of the Vulgar English, *He made himself of no Reputation.*

2. Because otherways, the Opposition here plainly intended by the Apostle, will not be exact: for if *the Form of God* must be taken *figuratively*, so as only to make this Sense, *he was like unto God*, was the Similitude or Likeness of God, as all other Men are; it will not answer to the other Member of the Opposition, which is not *Figure* but Reality; for *the Form of a Servant*, and *the Likeness of Men*, was intended to signify that Christ was a *real* Man, and not only that he was *like to Men.*

'Tis a very thin Sophistry this: When our Author left off to speak to the Vulgar, and would needs undertake (in this Passage) to speak to the Learned, he should have brought something that was more substantial, wherewith to blind such Eyes as theirs.

First; he saith, Jesus Christ was in the Form of God; that is, he was *really God* before he was Man; because this Text adds, that *he emptied himself.* Methinks that very Translation which our Author has affected, should have minded him of the Absurdity and absolute Impossibility of his Doctrine; for can he that is true God *empty himself?* can he lessen, much less *evacuate* himself? To what Labyrinths, to what Mazes and Wildernesses does Error lead Men: God, they are forced to say, *emptied* himself; their next News will

will be, *he ceased to be*, or was *annihilated*. But God is not only *necessarily existent*, as Philosophers speak, but he is always *necessarily the same*; no Change, much less any *emptying himself* (as they have learned to *cant*) can befal to him.

And why is this Preacher so hard to understand, that our Lord Christ might indeed (as he calls it) empty himself, though he were not God? Why cannot he call it an emptying himself, that our Saviour submitted to Apprehension, Persecution, Scourging and Death, at that very time when he could, by his miraculous Power, have destroyed all his Enemies, both Jews and Romans? Why must we say Christ was *in the Form of God*, and interpret it thus, that *he was God before he was Man*, on the Account that he *emptied* himself; when the very contrary is so obvious and easy to be discerned, even this, that *he was not God, because he could and did empty himself?*

Secondly; But the Opposition intended by the Apostle, he saith, will not be exact, if *the Form of God* must not signify *Reality*, as well as *the Form of a Servant*. Who told our Author, that *the Form of a Servant* here must be taken *in Reality?* Was our Saviour really a Servant to any Person? Do not all Men know, that he was only in the Form of a Servant, by his voluntary bearing of Injuries and Blows, without answering again, or avenging himself; that he might teach us by his Example, as well as by his Doctrine, to forgive one another? The Opposition is most exact: for as he was in the Form of God, without being really God; so he was in the Form of a Servant, without really being Servant to any. But Mr. *Lamoth* would clap together these two, was *in the Form of a Servant*, and was *in the Likeness of Men*; as if they were one, or signified the same thing: and it is upon this Mistake that his Argument proceeds; But *the Form of a Servant*, and *the Likeness of Men*, are most different things: and he ought also to have been aware, that *a new* Sense begins at these Words, *Being made in the Likeness of Men*, as I have shown before.

His last Proposition, from his Text, is, that Jesus Christ did not think it Robbery to be equal with God; so he words his Proposition at *p.* 9. I have observed before, that now the very *Boys* know, that ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, is not to be rendred, *he thought it not Robbery to be equal with God*; but *non rapuit æqualitatem cum Deo*, he assumed not to himself to be equal with God. If Monsieur *Lamoth* knew of this Translation, but *dissembled it*, he prevaricated with his Hearers, and sought *disingenuously* to impose upon them: if he knew of it, but *disliked it*, why did he not give his Reasons against it?

Here our Author takes leave of his Text, and falls to proving our Saviour's Divinity from the 5*th* Chapter of St. *John*'s Gospel: the Words he picketh out are these; *As the Father raiseth up the Dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.*——*That all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.*——*The Hour is coming, and now is, when the Dead shall hear the Voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath Life in himself, so hath he given to the Son, to have Life in himself.* And as if these Words had ended the whole Controversy between him and the Socinians, he falls to his French *Rhodomontades*, and *Pædagogical* Triumphs. He tells us, 'Tis impossible for any 'to equal himself more positively with God 'than our Saviour here doth in these Words: 'They do not in the least need a Commenta-'ry to warrant us, to say with St. *Paul*, that 'our Saviour thought it not Robbery to be 'equal with God his Father.

He takes no notice, that in what Sense soever we are to understand it, that *the Son quickeneth whom he will*, and is to be *honoured as the Father*, and *will make the Dead to hear his Voice*, and *hath Life in himself*: yet he professeth here, that *the Father hath given them to him*: that is, he professeth that himself is not God, because he hath not these Powers of himself, but *by the Goodness and Gift of another Person*. Our Author too passes it over, that as a farther Caution against being mistaken by any, our Saviour solemnly *prefacts* his

whole Discourse here with these Words, *Verily, verily I say to you, the Son can do nothing of himself*, nothing by his own *proper* Power and Authority; and that he *concludeth* them with another Antidote, against being either misunderstood or misrepresented, even with this, *the Works which the Father hath given me* (hath given me Command and Power) *to finish, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me, i. e.* that I am the Father's Messenger and Ambassador. Finally, he omitteth too, that all these Expressions are so interpreted by the more Learned even of his own Party, as that they suppose that our Lord Christ here speaks of himself only as a *Man*: for they say, *the Son quickneth whom he will*, in that he raised from the dead *Lazarus*, the Widow's Son, and some others, and could have raised many more, even as many as he should please. And *all Men should honour the Son as they honour the Father*; because the Ambassador representing the Majesty of him that sends him, his Person is *sacrosanct*, and in divers Respects to be honoured as his *Principal* is, by the Law of Nations. Again, *the Dead shall hear the Voice of the Son of God*; for he would call divers from the Dead, as former Prophets had done. 'Tis added, last of all, *he hath Life in himself*: all agree, that the meaning is, he so possesseth the Fountain of Life, by the Gift of God, as that he restoreth Life to whomsoever he will. If Mr. *Lamoth* was not aware of these Interpretations, 'tis his *Dulness* or his *Negligence*; if he was, that he dissembles them, is his *Dishonesty*; out of respect to his Coat I am desirous to think the former.

I see nothing further that is considerable in his first Discourse, but an impious Reflection on the Person of our Saviour, and another on the Scriptures. Of our Saviour he saith at *p.* 19. that if he is not God, the Sum of the Christian Religion will be this, that a certain Teacher is come to instruct Men by exact Morality, and by a perfect Example, with regard to those Vertues that we ought to practise in our Lives; *but against whom are some things to be objected, with regard to those Vertues that are of use at the Point of Death.* This usual Scandal of some Trinitarians upon our Saviour, that he was *pusillanimous* or fearful at the Point of Death, is fully answered at *Chap.* 11. *pag.* 55. of the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn*. But I wonder that they should not consider that this (false) Charge of theirs against our common Master is much more colourable on their Hypothesis, and much less excusable than on ours: For *we* say, the Lord Christ was a Prophet; *they* say, he was also God. Now that a *Man* should have quick Apprehensions of approaching Death, especially of a Death *shameful, painful* and *undeserved*, is no wonder, be sure is not sinful; but that a *God-man*, as *they* think him, should be disturbed at Death, is altogether unaccountable.

As to the Scriptures, he says at *p.* 20. If Jesus Christ was no more than a *Man*, those Texts of Scripture that speak of that wonderful Mercy and Love of God, in giving this Saviour to Mankind, *have no Sense at all.* He affirms moreover, that for God to make only a *Creature*, that by his Means he might save so many *Millions* of Men, *was no more than if he had given a Straw to save them.* I had thought (I confess) that French Ministers would not have *licensed* such *Outrages* to the Press: And if it was with so little Regard to the Honour of our Saviour, and to the Holy Scriptures, that they managed their Controversies in *France*, I had almost said they were deservedly banish'd.

To his Objections concerning the Names of God, which he saith are also given to the Lord Christ in Holy Scripture.

MR. *Lamoth*'s second Discourse begins with an Acknowledgment, that *to mistake a Man for God is the most dangerous of all Errors whatsoever.* Is it so, then why has he said so often, that nothing can excuse the Socinians for opposing the Doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity? For if that Doctrine is an

Error,

Error, he himself has confess'd, *'tis the most dangerous of all Errors whatsoever.* But he saith, that Doctrine is no Error; for that our Saviour is true God, is made evident by these three Observations.

1. He hath *the Names* of God given to him by the Writers of Holy Scripture.

2. Besides the Names of God he hath also *the Attributes* of God ascribed to him.

3. And to put the whole Matter out of doubt, *the Worship* due only to God is also given in Scripture, and there *required to be given* to him.

First; The Lord Christ hath *the Names* of God given to him, *John* 1. 1. *The WORD was God.* Nay he is called the *true* God, and the *great* God, 1 *John* 5. 20. *Titus* 2. 3. He saith moreover, that St. *Paul* writing to *Titus*, called our Saviour *God, at least four or five times*; and after a Line or two forgetting himself, he saith in that short Epistle, Christ is called God *three or four times.* Finally, he cites some Texts in which he thinketh the Name *Jehovah* is bestowed on our Lord Christ: But because we are sure he cannot shew us that Jesus Christ is once called God in the Epistle to *Titus*, but only out of that single Bible which is in his own keeping; and because the Words of St. *John*, *the true God*, and of St. *Paul*, *the great God*, are evidently spoken not of our Saviour, but of God; and because what he saith of the Name *Jehovah*, that 'tis applied to our Saviour Christ, is abundantly answered at *Ch.* 2. of the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn*; therefore here I shall only consider what he hath offered on the other Texts, in which (as 'tis commonly supposed) our Saviour hath the Name *God* given to him.

He takes notice, that *in* answer, that our Saviour is called *God* sometimes, because *he represented the Person of God, bringing to us the Commands of God*; for which Reason *Moses* is called God, and that by God himself; *Exod.* 7. 1. *See I have made thee a God to* Pharaoh. *Solomon* also is in this Respect called *God*, *Psal.* 45. 6, and 11. and so are the Magistrates, Princes and Judges of *Israel*, not only at *Psal.* 82. 6. but by our Saviour, *John* 10. 34, 35. Nay it appears by 1 *Sam.* 28. 11, 13, 14. that the Prophets who spoke in the Name and Person of God, were therefore called *Elohim*, Gods. To the Examples of *Solomon* and *Samuel* Mr. *Lamotb* saith nothing, I suppose, because he saw that neither of his two Shifts would serve him at all against those evident Instances: But to that of *Moses* he saith, his being *a God* is limited to *Pharaoh*; 'tis said of him by God, *I have made thee a God to* Pharaoh, not to others. But our Saviour is called God *absolutely*, without any Limitation to this or that Person or Persons. To the Example of the Princes and Judges of *Israel*, he saith, 'tis not any Magistrate *in particular*, who is ever called God, but all of them in *general*; but our Saviour is *in particular* called God.

Let us begin with his second Answer, that no Prince or Magistrate *in particular* is called *God*; but it is said of them *in general* only, *Ye are Gods.* But why has Mr. *Lamotb* parted with such a Secret, that *he understands not Grammar, no nor common Sense?* For does not every *sensible* Man know, that *Generals* include in them *Particulars?* If I say to *many*, *Ye are Gods*, do I not thereby say to every one of those many, *Thou art a God?* When the King saith to his House of Peers, *My Lords*; or to the other House, *Gentlemen*; doth he not acknowledg every one of the former to be *a Lord*, and every one of the other to be *a Gentleman?* And why hath our Author so unadvisedly said, that no Magistrate, Prince or Angel, is ever *in particular* called God or *a God* in Holy Scripture? *Samuel* and *Solomon* are so called *in particular*, Psal. 45. 6, 11. 1 *Sam.* 28. 11, 13, 14. The Angel that spoke to *Moses* in the burning Bush, is called God; and so is *Moses* himself, *Exod.* 3. 2, 4. *Exod.* 7. 1. Other *particular* Angels are called Gods (it may be) twenty times in the Scriptures, by Confession of the ablest Criticks and Interpreters of our Author's own Party.

Nor is his first Answer a-whit better than the second, but rather less considerate and advised: He saith, *Moses* is not called God *simply* and *absolutely*, but *with Limitation*; he is

is said to be a God *to a particular Person*, a God to *Pharaoh*; not absolutely God or *a* God. Now either he will *abide* by this Reply as sound and good, or he will not. If he will not, then our Answer (that *Moses* as well as Christ is called *God*) remains in its full Force. But if he saith, he will *abide* by it as a good and sufficient Reply to us, then he hath given up to us that only Text, in which the Name *God* is bestowed on our Saviour: For the Socinians easily satisfy the more learned of their Opposers, that all the other Texts in which 'tis by some supposed that our Lord Christ is called *God*, were indeed intended, not of the Lord Christ, but of the Almighty *Father*, whom all acknowledg to be God: but the Words of St. *Thomas* (at *John* 20. 28.) Thomas *said to him* (to Jesus) *my Lord and my God*, are generally allowed, as well by Socinians as others, to be spoken *to* and *of* the Lord Christ. To this Text therefore *Socinus* answers, in the same manner that Mr. *Lamoth* doth here concerning *Moses*, that the Lord Christ is not called God, *simply* and *absolutely*; but *with Limitation* to a particular Person, he was a God to *Thomas*: *Thomas* doth not say *absolutely*, O Lord God, but *my* Lord and *my* God; the personal Pronoun *my* limits the Sense of the Words to *Thomas*, and suffers us not to extend them, or take them in an absolute of a general Sense. For my part, I always thought this to be a *frivolous* shift, but it should seem Mr. *Lamoth* approves of it; he thinks a Person is not really called a God, or hath not the Name *God* really given to him, if he is not called God *absolutely*, *without Limitation* to a particular Person. I say therefore, let him take his Choice; either let him say, he will not *abide* by this Answer; and then *our* Answer also (that *Moses* too is called *God*) will be sufficient and home; or let him abide by it, and then he has given up to us that only Text in which the Name *God* is given to the Lord Christ, even these Words of *Thomas*, *My Lord and my God*. But I desire you, Sir, to remember also, how clearly I have satisfied that Text, the Words of *Thomas*, at *Chap.* 6. *p.* 32, 33. of the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn*.

To his Proofs that the Attributes *of God are ascribed to Christ.*

HIS second Proof, or rather his second *Class* of Proofs, that the Lord Christ is God, is this, that *the Attributes* of the Divine Nature are ascribed to him no less than to God. And I will make choice, saith he, of *six* of the Divine Attributes to verify my Argument; Eternity, Immensity, Holiness, Knowledg, Power and Mercy. These Properties, saith he, are in the Lord Christ, *in such manner as belongs to God only*; therefore the Lord Christ is also God.

First; For Eternity, he saith, 'tis proved to be in Christ, because the Author to the *Hebrews* (*Ch.* 1. 11.) applies to our Lord Christ what had been said by the Psalmist concerning God, namely these Words of Psal. 102. 26, 27. *They* (the Heavens) *shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a Garment: as a Vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy Years have no end.* He quoteth this Text to prove *the Eternity* of our Lord Christ; that I may use his own Words, *not only the Eternity which is to come, but his Pre-eternity, or the Eternity which is past.* If he had alledged it to prove the fifth Attribute, *the Power* of the Lord Christ, because 'tis here said, *he shall change the Heavens:* We would have informed him, that the Heavens here spoken of, are not the *material* Heavens, but *the new Heavens and new Earth*, or the Gospel-Oeconomy and State of things, as I have largely proved at *Chap.* 3. of the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn*. But seeing he citeth this Text to prove the Pre-eternity of our Saviour, or the *Eternity which is past*, we are constrained to answer in short, that (till he shows it more particularly) we cannot discern the least Shadow of a Pretence to draw that Conclusion from this Text.

But the same Epistle to the Hebrews saith, *This Man* (Jesus Christ) *was counted worthy of more Glory than* Moses; *inasmuch as he who hath built*

built the House hath more Honour than the House, *Heb.* 3. 3. We answer, the House here meant is *Domus Dei*, the Christian Church, of which the Lord Christ was (under God) the Builder; but this House was not from Eternity.

Next he quoteth *Heb.* 7. 3. *He was without Father and without Mother, without Descent; having neither Beginning of Days, nor end of Life.* But all Interpreters, of both Perswasions, are agreed, that these Words are spoken of *Melchisedec*, whose Father and Mother, and the time of his Birth and Death, not being recorded any where in Scripture; he is therefore *figuratively* said to be without Father and Mother, without Beginning or End of Life. But he is not herein like to the Son of God, (the Time of whose Birth and Death is registred in Scripture, and whose *Mother* was Blessed *Mary*, his *Father* the everlasting God) but he is like the Son of God, in that *he abideth a Priest for ever:* Which he is said to do in respect of the Continuance (not of his Person, but) of his *Priesthood*, which ceaseth not, as did the *Levitical*, but is continued for ever in the Priesthood of the New Testament.

At *Heb.* 9. 14. 'tis said, that *Christ through the eternal Spirit offered himself to God.* This *eternal* Spirit Mr. *Lamoth* thinks was our Saviour's own eternal Spirit; but he hath not quoted the Place right: the Words are these, *Who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without Spot to God*; i. e. the Lord Christ by the Co-operation of the Spirit and Grace of God, was sinless and spotless, and so offered himself as an *immaculate* Sacrifice to God. The Emphasis lyeth not, in *offering himself*, or *by the Spirit*, but in offering himself *without Spot*, which was by the Co-operation of God's Grace or Spirit.

I see not what Weight or Force there is in his next Allegation, *Heb.* 13. 8. *Jesus the same Yesterday, to Day, and for ever.* When he tells us what he means by it, or how he forms an Argument from it, we will consider of it. But whereas he adds, that the Words at *Rev.* 1. 8. *I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which shall be, the Almighty*, are spoken of the Lord Christ; he should have proved it as well as said it, which when he does, we will give him the Cause: But he may see in the fourth Letter of the *Brief History of the Unitarians*, a demonstrative Proof, that the Words are spoken of God, not of the Lord Christ.

Come we now to the Attribute of Immensity, by which, he saith, our Saviour is present in all Places at the same time. For *this* he bringeth first those Words of our Saviour, *Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, I am in the midst of them*, Matth. 18. 20. We answer, Christ, though in Heaven, is in the midst of his People, *partly* by prophetick *Vision* and Knowledg, as St. *Paul* saith to the Colossians, *Though I be absent in the Flesh, I am present in the Spirit, joying and beholding your Order*, Col. 2. 5. And *partly* by that powerful Aid and Help which he affordeth to us; what by his Mediation with God for all in general, *Heb.* 7. 25. what by the Intervention of Angels, who are under his Directions, and by him engaged in the Defence of the Faithful, *Heb.* 1. 14.

As another Proof of our Saviour's Omnipresence, he gives us *John* 3. 13. *No Man hath ascended into Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in Heaven.* If he will needs have the last Words to be, *which IS in Heaven*, contrary to all the considerable Criticks, who read here, *which WAS in Heaven:* We say, the Lord Christ was then in Heaven, was in Heaven while he was upon Earth; in the same Sense that St. *Paul* saith the like of himself, when he propoundeth himself for an Example to the Philippians, Phil. 3. 20. *Our Conversation is in Heaven:* Namely, by Heavenly-mindedness, an heavenly Frame of Spirit, by heavenly Meditations and Contemplations. Mr. *Lamoth* dismisses the Consideration of these two Attributes, Eternity and Immensity, with this Reflection, that *they are absolutely incommunicable to Creatures.* But the most eminent Philosophers have been of Opinion, that they are both of them found in *Matter* or *Bodies*, as they speak. They suppose, that the *Motes*, Matter;

Matter or Substance of which the World is made, was *from all Eternity*; and that 'tis *immense* and *interminable*.

The third Attribute is *Holiness*; and the Lord Christ, saith our Author, *is holy, as God is holy*. He proveth this, because the Prophet *Isaiah* heard the Seraphims make this Acclamation to God, *Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts*: And the Evangelist St. *John* assures us, that this Lord of Hosts whom the Seraphims praised, was our Lord Christ; *John* 12. 41. *These things said* Isaias, *when he saw his Glory, and spake of him*. But the Criticks (both Fathers and Moderns) of our Author's own Party, plainly saw, that the Words of St. *John* are intended, not of the Lord Christ, but of God. They give two Reasons, which Mr. *Lamoth* (in his next) may do well to remove. They observe, that the Words immediately foregoing are certainly spoken of God; and that the best Greek Copies read here expressly, *these things said* Isaias, *when he saw GOD's Glory*.

He goes on; We say further, *the Lord Christ knows whatsoever God knows*. He thinks this *wild* Affirmation is proved by St. *Peter*'s Words to our Saviour, *Thou knowest all things*, *John* 21. 17. And by what St. *John* says of him, *he knew all Men*; and again, *he knew what was in Man*, John 2. 24, 25. but especially by what our Saviour saith of himself, *I am he which searcheth the Reins and Hearts*, Rev. 2. 23.

Let us begin with the Words of St. *John*, that *he* (Christ) *knew all Men*, and *knew what was in Man*. The Occasion of these Words will shew us their Intent and Meaning; certain Persons upon hearing our Saviour's Doctrine, and seeing his Miracles, believed on him; nevertheless, saith this Evangelist, *Jesus committed not himself to them, because he knew all Men, and needed not that any should testify of Man, for he knew what was in Man*. As who should say, 'The Lord Christ was not free to 'commit his Person or his Secrets to these 'new Believers; he did not judg them fit to 'be trusted till they were well grounded and 'settled in the Faith: he knew what all Men are, 'how *fickle* and *uncertain*, nay ofe-times *design-'ing* and *malicious*; so he needed not that any 'should bid him be cautious, or aware of 'Men: Himself knew better than all Men the 'Infidelity, Treachery, Variableness, and all 'other Infirmities of Men; therefore he 'would not confide in Persons not known to 'him by some Experience first had of them. This is the natural and obvious Sense of St. *John*'s Words; they are (very evidently) a Testimony of our Saviour's *Prudence* as a Man, not of his *Omniscience* as a God.

There is no more Force to Mr. *Lamoth*'s Purpose in St. *Peter*'s Words to our Saviour, *Thou knowest all things*. The Lord Jesus had said to *Peter*, Peter, *lovest thou me?* *Peter* grieved that such a Question should be put to him, answers, *Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest I love thee*. His undoubted meaning is, *There is no Secret hid from thee; thou foresawest my Fall, my unhappy Weakness in denying thee; but neither is it hid from thee, that I love thee; and then also loved thee, though for a Moment Fear overcame Love*. What is there in this Answer to persuade any reasonable Man that *Peter* made his Master to be God, or believed another, a second God? *Thou knowest all Secrets*; but was not *Peter* aware that it was *by Revelation from God*, by God's inhabiting Spirit or Inspiration, that our Saviour and so many other Prophets knew all the Secrets of the Persons with whom they conversed? Let us see whether we cannot even *wrest* it from our Opposers, that all our Saviour's Knowledg, whether of *Secrets* or of *things to come*, was by Revelation from God; not from his own proper and natural Omniscience as God! St. *John* speaking of our Saviour, in his present State of Exaltation, has this Passage; *Rev.* 1. 1. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him, to show to his Servants things that must shortly come to pass; and he* (Christ) *sent and signified it by his Angel* (or by his Messenger) *to his Servant* John. What Artifices, what Elusions or Shifts will Mr. *Lamoth* betake him to, to get rid of this Text, which indeed puttech an End to the Question of our Saviour's Divinity! For were he indeed

deed God, were his Knowledg of all *Secrets* and of *things to come*, from his own Omniscience as God, it could never have been said of him, *the Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him, to shew to his Servants.*

Our Opposer's last Hope is in the Words of our Saviour, *I search the Reins and Heart.* He ought to know, that to *search the Heart and Reins* is an Hebrew and Scripture-Phrase or Form of speaking, and signifies no more but this, *to know the most secret Thoughts and Purposes of the Mind and Heart.* This Knowledg is originally in none but God; but it may be in others derivatively, by Derivation or Revelation from God. Only God knoweth the Reins and Heart *originally of himself*, or *by his own proper and natural Omniscience*: but Prophets, and more especially our Saviour, search and know the Hearts, *secondarily, derivatively, by God's Revelation to them*, or by his inhabiting Spirit in them. We are assured, that only this last was our Saviour's meaning, in these Words, *I search the Heart*; by the first Words of this Book of Revelation, before quoted, even these, *the Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him.* There could be no need that God should make a Revelation to him, if he himself *knew the Reins and Heart* by a natural Omniscience of his own. In one Word, we ought not to stick at the mere Syllables, *I search the Heart*, but should consider the Import or Sense of that Phrase in the Scripture-Language; If it signifies only thus much, to know the Thoughts of the Heart or Mind, it will not prove the Person, of whom they are spoken, to be omniscient, or God, unless it be also said he knoweth the Heart *by his own Omniscience*, and not (as 'tis said of our Saviour) *by Revelation from God*, or God's inhabiting Spirit.

The fifth Attribute of God is his *Power*; and this Author fears not to say, at *p.* 40. the Lord Christ is *as powerful as God.* I marvel that a sensible Man could say such a thing; for *as powerful as God*, is plainly to say, *two* Almighties, and *two* Gods. 'Tis impossible for Mr. *Lamoth* to evade this contradictory and blasphemous Consequence, but by another which will be as silly as *this* is impious. He cannot escape it, but by saying, that the Lord Christ himself is that God; but then, *as powerful as God*, amounts to this, *as powerful as himself.* Hath Mr. *Lamoth* taken a Journey from *France* into *England*, to bless us with such a Discovery, that the Lord Christ is as powerful as himself, or *is as powerful as he is powerful?*

But here too we must examine his Proofs; our Saviour saith of himself, *John* 5. 19. *What things soever the Father doeth, those also doeth the Son.* Again he saith, *John* 6. 40. *He that believeth on me, hath eternal Life, and I will raise him at the last Day.* And St. *Paul* saith of him, Phil. 3. 21. *Who shall change our vile Body, that it may be like his glorious Body, according to the Working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself.* Lastly, we have this Argument of our Saviour's Almighty Power, that St. *John* saith, *Without him was not any thing made that was made*, John 1. 3. Which thing St. *Paul* dilates more largely in these Words; *For by him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible;—all things were created by him and for him*, Col. 1. 16.

'Tis the perpetual Method, Sir, of our Opposers, to argue from imperfect broken Passages of Holy Scripture, concealing what goes before, and what follows after; as also how those Expressions are elsewhere interpreted by the Scriptures themselves. But the Reason of this is, never so little Sincerity in quoting the Scriptures would ruine their Cause. Be you Judg, Sir, whether this be not a just Charge: The Lord Christ, saith Mr. *Lamoth*, is *as powerful as God*; for he himself saith, *Whatsoever things the Father doeth, those also doeth the Son*: but he conceals what goes before in the same Verse, *Verily, verily I say to you, the Son can do nothing of himself*: And what again follows at *ver.* 30. *I can do nothing of my self.* He was aware that these (explicatory) Expressions would destroy his Argument from that part of the Verse which he alledged to prove that our Saviour is *another Almighty*: therefore he was resolved only to quote the Part of the Verse, which being separated from the rest, and repeated by it self, would seem to make for his Purpose. But if you

add to these Words which he hath dislocated from the rest, even to these, *What things the Father doeth, those also doeth the Son:* I say, if to these you add, *the Son can do nothing of himself*; and again, *I can of my self do nothing*; our Saviour's meaning will be clearly this; 'The 'Son raiseth the Dead, giveth Sight to the 'Blind, and doth whatsoever else of that mi-'raculous Nature that the Father himself 'sometimes doth; but 'tis with this immense 'Difference, that *the Son can do nothing of him-'self*, nothing by his own proper Authority or 'Power, but by the Power and Spirit of the 'Father dwelling in him, as in former Pro-'phets. It is our Saviour himself, and after him the Apostle *Peter*, that make this Explication, and give this Account of that miraculous Power of our Saviour, by which he *did whatsoever things the Father doeth.* John 14.10. *The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the Works.* Matth. 12.28. *I cast out Devils by the Spirit of God.* Acts 2.22. *Jesus of Nazareth, a Man approved of God among you, by Miracles, and Wonders, and Signs, which God did by him in the midst of you.*

We have seen with what Conscience our Author quotes the Scriptures; I am desirous to make trial whether his Judgment be no greater than his Sincerity! Those Words of our Saviour which he is so desirous to conceal, the Son can do nothing *of himself*; and I *of my self* can do nothing: I beseech you, Sir, *are they the Voice of God*, or of *a Man?* Will he that is true God and Almighty, say, I can of my self do nothing; it is by the Power and Authority of another by which I do whatsoever I do!

Come we to his two next Places, that *Christ will raise Believers at the last Day*, and that he will *change their vile Bodies, to be like his glorious Body, according to that Power by which he is able to subdue all things to himself.* I will put a Question to this Gentleman: Doth Mr. *Lamoth* think that the Lord Christ, in his present State of Exaltation, now raises (or *will* raise) the Dead, by any other Power but *that* by which he raised the Dead while he lived upon Earth? His Hypothesis will not allow him to say that the Lord Christ hath now any *greater* or *other* Power than he had while he was upon Earth: It remains therefore that our Lord Christ will raise the Dead *at the last Day*, by the same Power by which he raised divers Persons in his Life-time. But I will demonstrate to him, that Power was not our Lord's *inherent*, proper or own Power, but given to him by God, *pro re nata*, for the present Occasion, and that too at the Instance, or Prayer, or Suit of our Lord Christ to God. We see *this* very plainly in the case of *Lazarus*, whose *vile* Body (nay whose *corrupted* Body) was by him *changed* and restored to Life: For when Jesus came to the Grave of *Lazarus*, to call him forth to Life again, before he says, Lazarus *come forth*, he first devoutly owns by *whose* Power he enterprised this Miracle; see his Words, *John* 11. 41. *Jesus lift up his Eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee, that thou hast heard me: And I knew that thou always hearest me; but because of the People which stand by, I say it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me. When he had thus spoken, he cried with a loud Voice,* Lazarus, *come forth.* I am willing, Sir, that our Opposers try all their Skill, use all their wonted, or any *new* Elusions, to wrest this Text out of our Hands. Let them tell us, whether our Saviour doth not here attribute both his Power and Authority of raising this dead Person, to only the Prevalence of his Prayers with God, who *always* (saith he) *heareth me.* Let them tell us, if they dare, and if it destroys not their Hypothesis; that now however, in his State of Exaltation, the Lord Christ hath *a new* Power; and that he shall raise the Dead, not as while he was upon Earth, by *an extraordinary* Power conferred on him by God, (who hath sometimes given the same Power to dead and dry Bones, 2 *Kings* 13. 21.) but by a Power *newly* grown up in himself.

To the Text of St. *John* concerning the WORD, *without him was not any thing made that was made*; I have largely shown in the 5th *Chapter* of the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn*, that the Evangelist is there speaking of *the new Creation*, or the Gospel-Oeconomy and State of things, not of the outward, visible, or material Creation or World. If Mr. *Lamoth* will

will satisfy the Reasons alledged in that Answer, the Socinians will be indebted to him for ever.

But he urges us, in the last Place, with St. *Paul's* Words, *Col.* 1. 16. *For by him were all things created, in Heaven and in Earth, visible and invisible; all things were created by him and for him.* It must be confess'd that this Allegation hath but one Fault. In the Judgment of all the Criticks and Interpreters of Note, of our Author's own Party, *'tis most falsly translated:* they read the Text after this manner, *for by him* (by the Lord Christ) *were all things modelled that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible; they were all modelled by him, and for him.* The *invisible* Powers of Heaven, even the Angelical Orders, and the State of Affairs upon Earth (more especially those of the Church) have undergone a very great Change, have been modelled, and as it were *new-made* by the Lord Christ. On Earth he hath abolished Paganism, Idolatry and Superstition, and introduced in their room the Knowledg of the one true God, and a moral Righteousness. In Heaven the Angelic Orders are put under his Directions, and by him engaged in the Defence of the Church, *Heb.* 1. 14. Mr. *Lamoth* may see in the fourth Letter of the *Brief History of the Unitarians*, how many learned Persons (Fathers and Moderns) of his own Party, have thus understood this Text: They plainly saw, that St. *Paul* speaks here of the new Creation, not of the original making, but the modelling or new-making of things: and I cannot think it necessary further to answer Monsieur *Lamoth* upon this Text, till he has satisfied the Reasons of the Judicious and Learned of his own Party.

The last Attribute to evince that the Lord Christ is equal with God, is his *Mercy*. Our Author saith, Christ's Mercy is sufficient to demonstrate him to be true God. His Proof of this is, that St. *Paul* so commonly wishes *Grace and Peace to the Churches, from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ.* He saith at *p.* 43. An Apostle would be *better advised* than to wish them *Grace* from any other but only God: the Scriptures he saith, *never tell us* of the Grace of Angels or of Men. He advances another Example of his Ignorance or his Forgetfulness, when he tells us, that 'tis said by our Saviour to the Disciples, *Baptize all Nations in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* And St. *John* saith, *There are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost:* but in the Scriptures nothing that is *created* is made to go hand in hand with God, or is reckoned in the same Line or Period with him. He adds further, but the Lord Christ is (in some Texts) not only reckoned with God, but is *set before him*, as in those Words of St. *Paul*, *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Love of God, the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you*; therefore without doubt he is true God. Can we imagine, saith this wary and judicious Author, *that the Scriptures would have committed such an Absurdity*, if the Son were no more than a Creature?

He is a pretty Gentleman; and seeing his Superiours have not thought fit to restrain his Extravagancies, 'tis necessary that his Opponent, who has the next Right, should. He is positive that Creatures are *never* set in the same Line or Context of Words and Sense with God, much less are set before him; and that Grace is *never* wished to the Churches from any but God. Now in his Hypothesis, the Lord Christ is God; therefore let him take his Bible, and find there this Text; Rev. 1. 4, 5. John to *the seven Churches which are in* Asia, *Grace be to you, and Peace, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his Throne, and from Jesus Christ.* Here Grace is wished from *the seven Spirits of the Presence*, and these are reckoned in the same Context of Words and Sense with God, and are set before our Saviour, who according to our Author, is true God. Nay, and the Author of this manner of speaking is St. *John*, that St. *John* on whom Mr. *Lamoth* hath bestowed some Pulpit-Rhetorick, telling us at *p.* 38. 'Let us make no Scruple to believe *the beloved* 'Disciple, who reposed himself on the Breast 'of the Son of God: Trust we to the piercing 'Sight of *this Eagle*, who took a View of

 'this

'this glorious Sun; Let us rely on the Testi-
'mony of the Evangelist, whose very End in
'writing his Gospel was to prove that Jesus
'Christ is the Son of God. With more such *Pedantry*, which however he taketh to be *Wit*.

To what he saith concerning the Worship of Christ; and the Conclusion.

WE are near our Deliverance from his Impertinencies: for at *p.* 44. he begins to speak to the last Argument of three, by which he undertook (at first) to prove our Saviour's Divinity, which is that *he is worshipped*. He saith here, that *Worship is* (as it were) *the Shadow of the Godhead*; let us therefore, saith he, *thereby take the Height and Elevation of our Saviour*. I shewed this Expression to a Friend of mine, asking him, what might be the meaning of it, or in what regard *Worship is* (*as it were*) *the Shadow of the Godhead?* He said, that I understood very little; for this is one of the *Mysteries* of the Trinitarians, which must be believed with an humble and implicit Faith, and not saucily pried into or enquired after. For all that I was of Opinion, that it hapned here to Monsieur *Lamoth* as to other Orators and eloquent Men, who when they come to the latter End of a Discourse, having well near spent their Embellishments and Flourishes, they fill up the vacant Spaces with a curious Mixture of *Flourish* and *Nonsense*. Worship is (as it were) *the Shadow of the Godhead*: there's *the Nonsense*; Mr. *Lamoth* himself will not deny it, upon second Thoughts, to be pure Nonsense. But then, *let us thereby take the Height and Elevation of our Saviour*; there's *the Flourish*, Decoration or Gild with which to cover it from Fools.

For the rest; Mr. *Lamoth* not having urged any thing from Scripture or Reason, for *the Worship* of our Saviour, but only what had been before said by Mr. *Milbourn*, to whom I have answered (so far as concerneth this Part of our Contest) at *Chap.* 10. of my Reply to him. I will pass now from the *argumentative* Parts of his Book to the *historical*; for he hath obliged us with the History of a new French Synod, held at *London* by ninety six French Divines, *March* 30, 1691.

He gives us the Result and Conclusions of this either Synod or *Riot* (for it assembled by no *legal* Authority, and the Assistants at it are punishable by our Laws) in seven declaratory Propositions; which seven Propositions may however be reduced to these two, that *the French Ministers are no Socinians*, and that *they are no Presbyterians*. The first of these Declarations is wholly *ridiculous*; the other is equally *surprizing* and *unadvised*; I will dispatch with both in two Words.

1. The French Ministers are no Socinians: Bless me! who ever said they were? Such as know the French Ministers, know very well that they are so far from being Socinians, that they never rightly understood what Socinianism is; they are so perfectly ignorant of the Merits of the Socinian Cause and Questions, that 'tis notoriously known, they are not conversant enough in good Books, to distinguish Socinianism from Remonstrantism: A Socinian and a Remonstrant are convertible Terms with the Generality of the French Ministers. Thence it is that their Brethren in *Holland* count the Clergy of the Church of *England* Socinians, because they are generally Remonstrants; and those Refugee Ministers who have joined in Communion with them, to be like as they are, unsound in the Faith.

2. They add, the French Ministers are (now) no Presbyterians. A foolish and a rash Declaration: What needed they to proclaim to all the Presbyteries here and abroad, that since their coming into *England*, *they have turned their Coats?* Was it worth their while to disown so publickly (as well as so causlesly and rashly) the original Discipline of their Church?

Let us hear how they have worded their *famous Recantation*; 'We *heartily* subscribe to 'the Confession of *Faith* of the Reformed 'Churches of *France*, without pretending to 'meddle with Matter of Discipline. They take here *a civil Leave* of Presbyterianism, and in *a Meiosis*, renounce the half of their Religion

gion at once: *We meddle not with Matters of Discipline*, that is, as we heartily profess the Points of *Faith* of our Churches, so we relinquish *the Discipline* of the same: They were not willing *to anathematize* the Presbytery, *that* had been somewhat too rigid for *new* Beginners and *young* Episcoparians. *But we meddle not with it*; we let it go in God's Name, to shift for it self, for we will be no longer concerned *with* it, or *for* it. I hope Mr. *Quick* will insert the Decrees of this *London*-Synod into his *Synodicon Galliæ reformatæ*; that the World may know, that the French Ministers, to their other Vertues, have added also that of the Age, *to temporize*. Nor am I so much their Enemy, but that I wish them some Fruit of so great a Complaisance to the Church of *England*, as the giving up to her, at once, *the Moiety* of their Religion.

Mr. *Lamoth* hath acquainted the World, what the French Ministers *are not*; I cannot restrain my self from declaring what some of them (too many) *are*: They are Peepers, Lurchers and Trapans; they skulk about the Presses, Booksellers Shops, and even at private Houses, to get Informations about *unlicensed* Books, and *heterodox* Opinions and Persons: They are Informers, not only in the Houses of Bishops, (who disdain at it) but in the Courts of Judicature, to the indelible and perpetual Scandal of their ministerial Function, as well as the Trouble and Danger of the Persons whom they illegally inform against, and prosecute for Matters of *mere* Conscience and Religion, or rather for their Love of Peace, and Desire of Catholick Unity.

Among the rest there is one Monsieur (I will conceal his Name for this once, but 'tis very like to) *Hocus*, who is excellent at the Discovery of an Heterodox Book, and at prosecuting the Author before *the Ecclesiastical* Judg, and then before *the Civil*. He is so brisk and *home* an Informer, that 'tis enough with him if a Book hath nothing *directly* heterodox, but only speaketh less considerately and advisedly, and so may have an Heterodox or *scandalous* Construction put upon it. But withal he is so *sneakingly* false, that while he is informing and setting the Officers at work to apprehend, he will very solemnly deny that he was the Mover of this Trouble. If he and his Fraternity would not be further exposed, not only here, but in *France*, where they will be glad to hear *the evil Report* of the French Ministers; they will for the time to come take some honester Course to recommend themselves to the small Gratuities which they may expect from such Services; Services that are odious (I can assure them) to those very Persons for whose Interests they are done. I will conclude with minding them of two things; that 'tis dangerous for particular Men to irritate a whole Party by Prosecution, there being no *Party* that can be called small or weak. And next, that if they find themselves harshly answered in this Reply to Mr. *Lamoth*, let them remember that they have given us an insufferable Provocation, there being nothing so intolerable as that Refugees for Conscience, should turn Informers and Persecutors for Matters purely conscientious, for mere Dissent in Points of Faith.

But I have done with them for this time: If hereafter Mr. *Lamoth*, or any others, shall think fit to ingage in these Controversies, and can forbear reproachful Reflections on a whole Party, keeping themselves to Matter of Argument, and to the Mistakes of this particular Defendant, they shall be answered *accordingly*. I will reply as shall become a Christian and a Gentleman; I will as little be guilty of Disrespect, without a notorious Provocation in the same kind, as I will quarrel with a Person that informs me of my Way, when he perceives I am out of it. I need add no more now, but that, Sir, I receive respectfully the large and surprizing Favours you have done to

Your most Obliged

and most Assured, &c.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

SIR,

I Send you herewith the Answer of one of our Friends, to the two Discourses of Mr. *Lamoth*, concerning the Divinity of our Saviour; if you send it to the Press, I pray let this present Supplement go along with it. For having seen the Articles of some French Ministers, exhibited at the Ecclesiastical Court of my Lord the Bishop of *L.* against Dr. *A. L.* at first I admired at the Impertinence, the Boldness and Malice of their Undertaking; but afterwards I thought also it might be fit to take this Occasion, to mind them of some things, of which (I am persuaded) they have never duly thought.

In the first Place they have dared to article against a Person, in an Ecclesiastical Court, contrary to the *express* Words of a *Statute* or *Act* of Parliament: For the late Act of Parliament concerning Toleration and Indulgence in Matters of Conscience and Religion, granted to Socinians as well as other Protestants the Benefit of that Act, except only in Case that they shall *print* or *preach* in Defence and Vindication of their Opinions. The Socinians are as much tolerated and favoured by that *Act* as any other Sect of Dissenters from the Church of *England*, if they content themselves to hold their Opinions, or to reason and discourse of them in familiar Talk; the *Act* debarreth us from only the Liberty of *Preaching* or *Writing* in favour of them. But now the Person against whom the French Ministers article, hath committed no such Offence; they do not so much as pretend that he has *written* or *preach'd* against the received Doctrine of the Church: these Ministers therefore are guilty of an Insult upon the English Laws, and the Statutes of our Kings and Parliaments; and are liable to a Prosecution thereupon in the Civil Courts, by the Persons whom they have particularly wronged, or by any other *publick-spirited* Persons, to whom the Liberties of the Nation are dear. They may happen to find some not obscure Persons, who in due Place and Time will make the Ministers sensible, that 'tis not for *Refugees* to trample upon the Laws of the Country where they are received and protected; and least of all upon those Laws which were made and designed for the Ease and Peace of the Nation, and on which the Welfare and Safety of the Nation do much depend.

But the Person, it should seem, against whom they article, hath no need of any Relief from the Act of Indulgence; he is accused by the Ministers as a Socinian, only because *he is not a Sabellian*, and because *he holds the Necessity of good Works*. They article, that he hath (*malitiously and wickedly*) affirmed, speaking concerning the Blessed Trinity, that he could clearly prove, that *three are not one*, and that *one and two are three*. He answers, that he meant thereby, that *three Persons are not one Person*; that is, he is no Sabellian, he believeth the real Distinction of the Persons, or as the Athanasian Creed saith, he confoundeth not the Persons. They article, that he hath (*malitiously and heretically*) said, that *Jesus Christ hath merited nothing for us*, and that *he hath but done what he was obliged to do*; *or Words to that effect*. He answers, that his Words were not to that Effect; the true and whole meaning of his Words was only this, that the Merit and Satisfaction of the Lord Christ is to be so interpreted, as not to destroy, supersede or dispense with *good Works of our own*, that is to say, a holy Life on our Part. This *indeed* is to be no Calvinist; but for all that, 'tis neither Heresy nor Socinianism; but it serves to confirm what our Friend hath said in his Answer to Mr. *Lamoth*, that 'tis notoriously known, that the French Ministers understand not what Socinianism is, and that they confound Socinianism with Arminianism or Remonstrantism. I am sorry for this same honest Dr. *A. L.* because though it appears by these and the rest of his Answers, that he is no Socinian, yet he is for *the Necessity of Holiness*, a good Life, or good Works; which Doctrine was ever so displeasing to Mr. *Calvin* and his Followers, the French

French Ministers, that sometimes they deny there is any such thing as good Works; and otherwhile they affirm, that good Works are not only no necessary Conditions of Salvation, but are even pernicious, dangerous and destructive thereof. They are so much of this Mind, that they make the contrary Doctrine to be *Heresy*; and because they think they cannot any way render it more odious, they call it *Socinianism*; but I advise them, seeing Popery is now so much abominated in *England*, that they would rather call it *Jesuitism*; they should have prosecuted this Dr. *A. L.* as a *Jesuit* rather than as a Socinian; that had been a way to set *the Rabble*, as well as the Spiritual Court, upon him.

But if Socinianism and the English Socinians are indeed such Eye-sores to these Ministers, as seems by their frequent Prosecutions of divers Persons on that Account before the Ecclesiastical Judges, and in other Courts, they should at least have shewn so much Justice, as not to misplace their Accusations, so grossly too, as they have done. This Dr. *A. L.* is the fourth or fifth Person to whom they have given a Publick Trouble, on the Account of Socinianism: they have been always baffled, and sometimes severely check'd by the Judges and Court; all this has not discouraged them, they having no Reputation to lose, from renewing their *Persecutions* of innocent Persons. But I advise them much, to lay the Saddle upon the right Horse; and let them not so wholly despise the Imputations of Calumny and Malice, Vices so unsuitable to their Profession of Ministers: Let them cease to accuse those that are not guilty, when they may easily find so many who are not only guilty of Unitarianism, if it be a Guilt, but are also *liable* upon that Account; my meaning is, have *preach'd* up and *written* for Unitarianism. They have, for Instance, the *four* Evangelists and the Apostles, notoriously guilty of the Heresy now called Socinianism; and their Words are so clear and express for it, that the Ministers need not fear the Imputation of Slander, if they shall article against them at the Places and Courts where they have lately libelled Dr. *L.* and Mr. *Gr.* If the Reader will pardon me, and not abate of his due Reverence, I will be content to prepare the Articles for the Ministers, in their own Forms and Terms; they shall have no other Trouble but what they so much affect and like, even to exhibit them in the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts.

1. You *Matthew*, stiled Apostle; and you *Mark*, called an Evangelist, have *mal. and vic.* complotted together, to *teach and write* the Heresy which denieth *the Omniscience* of the Son our Lord Christ, while you have reported and *published*, as from the Mouth of Christ himself, that *the Son knoweth not the Time of the last Judgment*; and that *only the Father* (whom all Men grant not to be the Son) *knoweth of that Day*, Mat. 24. 36. Mark 13. 32.

2. You *John*, calling your self Evangelist and Apostle, have not spared to *write* and *publish* scandalous, heretical and blasp. Words against the *Omnipotence* of the same our Lord Christ, affirming most injuriously and falsly, that *he can do nothing of himself*: and further, that it was *not he, but the Father dwelling in him, that did all the miraculous Works*. So you have said expressly, *John* 5. 19, 30. *John* 14. 10. With which monstrous Doctrine you *Peter* also symbolized when you *preached* to the Jews concerning the Lord Christ: for thus you say of him; *Jesus of* Nazareth, *a Man approved of God among you, by Miracles and Wonders, and Signs, which God did by him*, Acts 2. 22. Et objicimus & articulamur ut supra.

3. You the said *John*, *not having the Fear of — before your Eyes*, but led by an Heretical and blasp. Spirit, have *written* and *published*, and as from the Mouth of our Saviour, that *the Father is greater than he*, John 14. 28. To which Heresy you *Paul* have consented, when you do write to the Corinthians, that *the Head of the Woman is the Man, and the Head of Christ is God*, 1 Cor. 11. 3. But the divine *Athanasius* hath in his Creed expressly contradicted you.

4. And further, you *John* have *written and published* Words, in which 'tis evident that you designing to deny *the supreme Authority* of the Son our Lord Christ; for you make him to say, that *he came not of himself, but as sent by the Father*, and that *his Doctrine was not his own, but the Father's that sent him*; and that *as*

the Father had commanded him, so in all things spake he; John 8.42. John 8.28. John 12.49.

5. You *Luke*, called also an Evangelist, have been yet more audacious; you have *published* to the World, that the Lord Christ was not only *not God*, but that he needed to be strengthned in his Agonies before his Passion by an Angel, and that he prayed earnestly to God; as if he who was himself God, and the only true God, could need the Aid of an Angel, or to make Prayer to any whomsoever. The others, your Companions in this Heresy, have with some Modesty contented themselves to deny our Saviour's *Omnipotence*; but you have represented him, as in some Respects, *impotent* and *weak*, Luke 22. 43, 44.

6. All of you, jointly and severally, have spoken of God by only the singular Pronouns, *I*, *Thou*, *Me*, *Him*, *Himself*, *Thy self*, and such like; which Pronouns are never used in any Language but only of one single Person, not of more Persons; and hereby you have fully assured us, that your Belief is, that there is but one Person of God, not three Persons, or a Trinity of Persons. But you *Paul* have presumed to say, even in Terms, that God is but one Person: for you write to the Hebrews, that *the Son is* (what, God? No, but) *the Image of God's Person*, Heb. 1. 3.

7. To leave no Place for doubt, you *John* and *Paul* have expresly *taught* and *published*, that *only the Father is true God*; and him you make to be even *the God of the Son*, or the God whom the Son worshippeth and serveth: You have said and written, *Father,—This is Life eternal, to know thee (the only true God) and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*: or, *Jesus Christ thy Messenger*. And again; *To us there is but one God, the Father:——and one Lord* (or one *Master*, that is, Teacher) *Jesus Christ*. And you *Paul*, above all others, have inculcated and repeated this Doctrine: You tell the Corinthians, that *Christ shall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father*. And you advise the Romans, *that with one Mouth they should glorify God, even the Father*. Plainly, as if only the Father were God; *John* 17. 1, 3. 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. 1 *Cor.* 15. 24. *Rom.* 15. 6.

8. To burden you at present with no more; All of you, jointly and severally, have in such manner distinguished between God and the Lord Christ, that your way of speaking amounts to a plain Denial, that the Lord Christ is God. You make our Saviour himself to say to the young Man whom he loved, *Why callest thou me Good? there is none Good save one, that is God*. You say, *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Jesus Christ*. You exhort, *Let every Tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord* (Gr. that the Lord Jesus is the Christ) *to the Glory of God, the Father*. You cry out, *To God only Wise be Glory, through Jesus Christ*. You have taught, that *the Son shall be subject to him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all*; Luke 18. 19. 1 Tim. 2. 5. Phil. 2. 11. Rom. 16. 27. 1 Cor. 15. 28. If we put all these Expressions together, you are found to deny the Omniscience, the Omnipotence, and the supreme Authority of the Lord Christ: and in some Cases you make him to be even impotent and weak; and having thus divested him, as much as in you lies, of all the Grand Characters and Attributes of the Divine Nature, you add, that God is but one Person, and that this one Person is only the Father, and that Christ is a Man, whom we must always carefully distinguish from God.

Thus it is, and these are the Men against whom the French Ministers (in pursuance of their Principles) should have articled, in the Ecclesiastical Courts; these are the true Unitarians, and Fathers of Unitarianism, on whom the Blame and Charge should light. 'Tis in vain for the Ministers to rail at, and be *Informers* (in a strange Land) against modern Unitarian Books and Persons, unless they can first get the Apostles and Evangelists censured, and their Writings suppress'd. But in presenting the Articles, I would have Mr. *Lamoth* be Foreman, because they are suted to his Doctrine. I need not, Sir, add any more; I am of Opinion that the Ministers, for one while, may have enough of this.

I am your Assured,

E. E.

FINIS.

THE

Trinitarian Scheme

OF

RELIGION,

CONCERNING

Almighty God;

And MANKIND,

Considered both before and after the (pretended) *Fall*: With NOTES thereupon; which Notes contain also the *Unitarian* Scheme.

London, Printed in the Year, 1692.

The *Trinitarian* Scheme of Religion concerning Almighty God; and Mankind, considered both before and after the (pretended) *Fall*: with *Notes* thereupon; which Notes contain also the *Unitarian* Scheme.

Of the Blessed *Trinity.*

"THERE are Three *Divine* "Persons, an Almighty Father, an Almighty Son, an Almighty Spirit distinct from both, who are jointly *Creators* of all other, both "Persons and Things. They are so many "distinct *Minds* and *Spirits*, indued each of "them with his own *Proper* and *Personal* "Understanding, Will, and Power of Action. *Each* of them is an absolutely Perfect "and All-sufficient Being; and *singly* and *by* "*himself* a God. Yet all of them together "are but one God.

The Notes.

There is *a* most Holy, most Wise, most Good and Almighty *Person*, who is over all, from everlasting to everlasting; the Maker of the Universe; the Fountain of Good to all other Beings, every where present. Who with respect to the Creation of the World, and his Adoption of all Good Men, is pleased to permit himself to be called *the Father*. But with respect to his Sovereign Dominion and Power above all, He is usually designed by the Name or Word GOD.

There neither is nor can be more than one such Person.

Because He is All-sufficient for himself, and for whatsoever He shall please to make; He had (thereby) within himself a most *Determining* and *Certain* Cause why he should neither *begot* nor *make* another or others *equal to Himself*, but only Subordinate and Dependent Beings, for Objects and Exercises of his Goodness. More such *Persons* or *Beings* as Himself, He knew must be as needless and useless, as himself is absolutely and indispensably necessary. For if He is *truly* All-sufficient, they must (for that reason) be *altogether* superfluous, both to him and to his Creatures.

Nor can we suppose more than one such Person, without supposing *an Infinity* of them. For whatsoever, either *Rational Motive*, or *Natural* and *Necessary Cause*, may be feigned; why the Universal Father should beget or make another, or others, *equal to Himself*;

the ſame (whether Motive or Cauſe) muſt alſo diſpoſe that other, or thoſe other Perſons, to *beget* or *make* their Equal or Equals, and ſo onwards till there were an Infinity of Divine Perſons.

The Nature therefore of the thing *demonſtratively* ſhows, that a ſtop is neceſſarily made at one Divine. that is, one Infinite and All-ſufficient Perſon.

Of the Eternity *of the Trinity.*

" AS to the Duration, Eternity or Life " of the Bleſſed Trinity, the Trinity " poſſeſſes Eternal Life *all at once.*

" To all other Beings, Time is a Flux " or Succeſſion; that of it which was, now " is not; and that which now is, ſhall im- " mediately give place to what is coming. " It was once true of all other Beings but " the Trinity, that they *were*, *are* and *ſhall* " *be*; but to the Trinity there is neither " paſt, nor to come, but whole Time or " all Eternity is *now*. To the Trinity *from* " *everlaſting to everlaſting*, is but one undivi- " ded *Inſtant* or *Moment*; for the Trinity *is*, " we may not ſay *it was*, or *it ſhall be.*

The Notes.

This Divinity is wholly borrowed from the *Platoniſts*; from whom the Modern Doctrines of the Trinity, and of the *Myſtical* Properties and Attributes thereof, have been learned by thoſe, who *among themſelves* go by the Names of *Orthodox* and *Catholick*. The Trinity, or God, ſay they, poſſeſſes Eternal Life *all at once*; He *is*, we may not ſay He *was*, or He *ſhall be*. In direct oppoſition to this *whimſical* Paradox, St. *John* has defined God to be *Him which WAS, which IS, and which SHALL BE*, or *is to come*, Rev. 1. 4.

We ſay therefore, 'tis one of the Divine Perfections (not an Imperfection) that God *IS*, *WAS* and *SHALL BE*. He hath carried, and ſhall carry all Perfections into all the Succeſſions and Periods of Time: when He *WAS*, he was no leſs perfect than now that he *IS*; nor is He now leſs perfect than he ſhall be when he *SHALL BE*.

They tell us, we muſt not ſay, *God WAS*; that is, to pleaſe them, we muſt turn Atheiſts, by ſaying *he WAS NOT*; for of neceſſity we muſt ſay one of the two, either that He *was*, or that He *was not*; there being no middle between theſe two, no more than there is between *He is*, and *He is not*.

Of the Omnipreſence *and* Infinity *of the Trinity.*

" NOR are we to conceive of the Infi- " nity, Immenſity or Omnipreſence " of the Trinity after a vulgar manner. " For tho the Trinity is truly Infinite and " Omnipreſent, yet 'tis *whole and all* in any " the leaſt Point of Space.

" The Trinity has *no Extenſion*, and yet " it comprehends *all Diſtances*. The Tri- " nity is three ſuch Perſons, as that each " of them reaches *over* and *through* all the " the World; and yet *all Three are laxly* " *and largely accommodated on the Point of* " *a Needle*. Not only ſo, but the right " Faith is, the Trinity is *no where*, and yet " 'tis *every-where*.

The

The Notes.

This is another Article of the new *Platonick* Divinity: God, or the Trinity, say they, is *whole and all* in the least point of Space; and tho he is *no where*, yet he is *every-where*. We say on the contrary (with St. *Austin*) what is *no where*, is *nothing*: therefore to speak as they do of God, is *in words* to affirm him, and *in sense* to deny him.

That God is *every-where* we are ready to demonstrate to them, from the Order and Conservation of his *Works*, and from the Effects of his *Providence*, and from an hundred Passages of Holy Scripture. That he is *no where*, is incumbent on them to prove; which we are sure they can do by no *Reason*, nor by any *Authority*, but that of their Masters the *Platonists*.

Every-where and *no-where* are *contradictory* Terms; therefore if God is every-where, it must needs be false that he is no-where: else we cannot distinguish between Affirming and Denying; that is, between express Contradictions.

Of the Simplicity *of the Trinity.*

"THere is no less *Mystery* in the other "Properties and Attributes of the "Trinity. For God is one most simple "*uncompounded* Being; yet He consists, or is "*made up* of Three really distinct Minds, "Beings, or Spirits; so really distinct and "*diverse*, that *one of them is not the other*; "nay, one is the Father, another *his* Son, "the third a Spirit, as distinct from both, "as they are from each other.

The Notes.

There is no Mystery at all in any of the Properties or Attributes of God. They are no less *clear* in themselves, than they are *evidently* deduced from the Excellence of his *Works*, and the Methods of his *Providence*. The Mystery never lies in the Attribute or Property, but in the Addition made to it by *fanciful* Men. As to that vulgar Aphorism, that God is a most simple and *uncompounded* Being, (from whence they have hammered the Property or Attribute of God's *Simplicity*, as they affect to speak) 'tis not only *not true*, but self-contradictory in the sense they use it. For, how is God most simple and uncompounded, if he consists or is *made up* (which is the very *English* of the word *compounded*) of distinct Beings, and divers and several Persons, *none of which is the other?* They may with the same Exactness of Grammar, and Propriety of Speech, say, a *Common-Council*, or a *Common-Hall*, is one most simple uncompounded Being; one is no more ridiculous than the other: for the *Propriety* of Speech, and *Exactness* of Truth, is as verily lost in *three*, as in *three hundred*, or *three thousand*.

What is in *God, is God.*

"FOR the other Properties, 'tis the Or-"thodox and true Belief, that *what-"soever is in God, is God*. Not only the "Father is God, and the Son is God, and "the Holy Spirit is God; but whatsoever "else is in God *by way of Immanence*; that "also is God. So *the Justice* of God, is "God; *the Power* of God, is God; *the*

"*Wisdom*

" *Wisdom* of God, is God; and so too is " the Goodness of God.

" Yet we make not hereby, so many " several Gods; because these and all o- " ther Properties of God, are not only the " same with him, but *the same also with one* " *another*. The Justice (for instance) of " God differs not *really* from his Power and " Mercy: and his Power and Mercy differ " not, or are not *really* distinguish'd from " his Wisdom, but are verily and identi- " cally the same with it, their distinction " is only *in our Conceit*.

The Notes.

See here another *brace* of *Mysteries*; *whatsoever is in God, is God*; and *the Divine Properties or Attributes differ not, but are the same with one another*.

The Reader may perhaps suspect, that when they speak after this *wild* fashion, they have some *secret* and *reserved* meaning, contrary to the *usual* Import of the Words, or a *learned* Sense contrary to the *vulgar* Signification of the Terms: but 'tis not so, they mean as they speak, and whole Volumes are written in Defence of these Follies.

But let us consider what they say; *Whatsoever is in God, is God; the Justice* (for instance) *of God is God; and so also the other Properties and Attributes*. As who should say, every Property of a Being or Nature is that very Being or Nature, of which 'tis only a Property. This is more monstrous than to say, *a Part is the Whole*, that very *Whole* of which 'tis only a *Part*. For a Property being somewhat less than an *Integrating* Part, because it may be away, or at least be dormant and unactive, without destruction of the Specifick Nature, or of the Person, an *Integrating* Part cannot; therefore 'tis more absurd to say, a Property, or Attribute is that very Being or Nature to which it belongs, than to say, an *Integrating* Part is the *Whole*. Thus *Body* and *Soul* are Integrating Parts of Man; take away one of them, and he is no longer a Man, but a naked Spirit; and *Risibility* is an acknowledg'd *Property* of the Human Nature, and yet it may be dormant, or wholly away, and the Human Nature not be destroyed, but remain.

But they add, the Properties or Attributes of God are *the same with one another*, they differ only in our Conceit.

But why do they not tell us too, that God pardons Sinners by his *Justice*, and punishes them by his *Mercy*; that he made the World by his *Eternity*, and will judg it by his *Immensity*? For if Mercy and Justice, if Wisdom and Power, if Eternity and Omnipresence are the same, and *differ only in our Conceit*; then the Effects of any one of these Properties are not to be *appropriated* to that Attribute or Property, but must be equally and indifferently ascribed to all, or to any of the rest.

Thus unlucky are our Opposers, both at *dividing* and *compounding*; they *divide* what is most intimately the same, and they *compound*, unite and identify what are and ever must be diverse and different. That Unity of God (or that *God is one*) which should have been as carefully guarded as the very Belief of a God, they have *divided*, by introducing a Trinity of three equally All-mighty and All-sufficient Persons. And the Properties of the Divine Nature, to whose Distinction and Variety we must heedfully attend, if we will have any adequate Notion of God, or right Understanding of his Works and Providences, these they *confound*, by affirming they are the same. But let us go on to what remains.

What

What we are to understand by the Son *and* Holy Ghost.

" GOD is *one substantial and most simple* " *Act*; yet we say also God is *two* " *substantial and really distinct Acts.* The " two substantial and immanent Acts in " God, are *Understanding* and *Will.* For " God most perfectly *understands* himself, " and also *willeth* (that is, loveth) him- " self in the most perfect manner.

" But whatsoever understandeth, doth " understand by *conceiving* an Image of the " thing understood. Therefore God (as " hath been said) understanding himself " from all Eternity, *conceived* within him- " self from all Eternity a most perfect " *Image* of himself. Which Image thus " *conceived*, and (as it were) *generated* or " *begotten* by him, is called *the Son.* And " this Image being *in* God, and *a perfect* " Image of God, and *Eternal*, is God no less " than *the Father*, by whom it was conceived " or generated in the manner aforesaid; " namely, by his understanding or appre- " hending himself, and his own Perfections.

" But God also *willeth*, and that is another " *the substantial immanent Acts* that concur " to the essentiating the Trinity. He *willeth* " or loveth himself, and the most perfect " Image of himself; and the Image *willeth* " or loveth him. This *Mutual Love* of the " Father, and the Image (or *Son*) is what " is named *the Holy Ghost.* So that what " things in Men are *Facultiss*, *Actions* and " *Properties*, in God we must understand " them to be *Persons* and *Spirits.*

" Which is also farther both cleared and " proved, by this Observation. The second " Person, or *Son*, is the Understanding or " Wisdom of God; not *Original Wisdom*, or " Understanding, for that is the Father; " but *a reflex Wisdom*, that is, the Wisdom " which resulteth from the Father's under- " standing himself, and his own Perfecti- " ons. The Holy Spirit (as hath been " said) is the mutual, willing, Love and " Power of *Original Wisdom*, and of the " *Reflex Wisdom.*

The Notes.

This they pretend is that *Mystery hid from Ages and Generations, but now made manifest* to the Disciples of *Athanasius.* There is no Parallel for it in all either History or Nature, but the Mysteries of the *Egyptians.* For as the *Egyptians* were at prodigious Cost, in making and setting up a great number of Images *in* and *about* their Temples, by which *Hieroglyphicks*, or sacred Images, they pretended to teach Men the Secrets of *Natural Philosophy*, and the Precepts of *Morality*; but when they were ask'd to explain the meaning of these *Hieroglyphicks*, they gave a very *mean* and *trifling* Sense, or a Sense very *absurd* and *false.* So after Trinitarians have long amused their Disciples with Terms as *Mystical* as the *Egyptian Hieroglyphicks*, such as *Trinity, Eternal Generation, Eternal Procession, three Infinite Persons and but one God:* Ask them, *How can these things be*, and what do you mean? They answer, our meaning only is, God *understands* himself, and *willeth* (that is, esteems and loves) himself. This is a very mean and despicable Sense, to be couched in such *mysterious* and *surprising* Terms: Why do they affect to speak *fantastically*, when they might speak *soberly* and *plainly?*

But we would easily forgive them *the Folly* of their Mysteries, if their *Hieroglyphick Language* were not as false and contradictory as 'tis vain and trifling. For after they have told us, that by *Son* and *Spirit*, they mean nothing but God's *Knowledg* and *Love* of himself; that *the Eternal Generation* (so much talk'd of) is only God's *conceiving, understanding*, or apprehending his own Perfections, and *the Procession* (which we are so carefully to distinguish from the *Eternal Generation*) is only *the Love* which *proceeds* from God

God towards himself: after (I say) they have thus unriddled their *Mystery*, and of a Mystery, made it a very vulgar and ordinary piece of Knowledg; how absurd and monstrous is it to tell us, that this Reflex *Knowledg* which God hath of himself, and his *Love* or Esteem of himself, are *Persons* and *Spirits* really distinct from *him?*

One while the Second and Third Persons (so called) are only God's *knowing* himself, and *loving* himself; that is, they are only *two Acts of his Understanding and Will.* At the next turn, these two Acts, God's *Apprehending* himself, and *Esteeming* himself, are metamorphosed into Two several *Spirits* and *Persons*; whereof one you must call *the Son*, and the other *the Holy Ghost:* Of one you must say, on pain of Damnation, He was *Conceived*, Generated or Begotten; of the other you must believe and say, under the same Penalty, He *proceeded.*

I say now, this is *Egyptian* all over; 'tis the very Genius and Spirit of the old Mystical *Hieroglyphicks*, that is to say, partly *Foolish*, and partly *False*. And to prove it, I need go no farther, than the Understandings and Consciences of all Reasonable Men; or even of every Individual Man, who hath not as much given up his *Reason* to Mother-*Church*, as the Good Man who would not believe his Eyes against his Dear Wife, had given up to her his *Senses*. To tell Men, that to *apprehend* one's self is *a Person*; and to love one's self, is another *Person* and *Spirit*; is (in effect) to ridicule Religion, and to scare from it all Men of free Sense.

I know not why the prophane *Wit* was esteemed an Atheist, for his saying, God by his Almighty Power can turn *a Tree into a Syllogism*; more than such may be justly suspected of Atheism, who say, an Action of the Divine *Understanding*, is an Infinite and Almighty *Person*, whom under pain of Damnation we must call *the Son of God:* And again, an Action of the Divine *Will* is another such *Person*, and him we must name *the Holy Ghost?* For *the Wit* only turned *a Substance* into *a Thought*; and Trinitarians turn *Thoughts* into *Substances* and *Persons*. Did they alledg for these Mysteries, but the least colour of *Reason* or *Revelation*, we would hold our Tongues; but to be obliged to believe such things, without any pretence of *Revelation*, and contrary to all *Reason* and *common Sense*, this (I think) is what we owe to no sort of Men, of what colour soever they dye their Coats.

For my part I never think of these, whether *Dotages* or *Impostures*, without such an Inclination as I very hardly resist, of applying to our *Athanasian* Doctors, what *Cato* said of the *Roman Augures* and *Aruspices*. I wonder, says *Cato*, that an *Augur* or *Aruspex*, can meet another of the same Profession, without their Laughing in one another's Faces. He knew their (pretended) Learning and Discipline, was *the Religion establish'd by Law; warranted by Custom and Prescription; and authorized by the Consent of Nations.* For all that, 'twas a Cheat so gross and palpable, that he could not but admire, that the *Augurs* were such *stark* Fools, or such *perfect* Knaves, that (meeting) they could carry a grave Look upon one another.

Of the Creation.

"IN the Fulness of Time, the before-"described *Trinity* Created the World, "and all things therein. Yet we are not to "imagine, that the Three Divine Persons "*divided* the Work among them, each of "them taking a Part. Nor could every "one of them Create the same things, be-"cause a thing can be created but once. "But according to that *Oeconomy*, as *Divines* "speak (that is, the Domestick Order, or

"*Household*-

" *Houshold-Government*) that is between the
" Three Persons, it must be said and held,
" that *the Father* is most *properly* the Crea-
" tor, *the Son* the Redeemer, and *the Spirit*
" the Sanctifier, of all Persons and Things.
" So that when we say, the Trinity Crea-
" ted Heaven and Earth, and all Things,
" this is thereby intended; The Father
" Created all things, *by* the Son, *through* the
" Holy Ghost.

The Notes.

The Father created all things *by* the Son, *through* the Holy Ghost.

I wish *the Sages* of the Party had thought fit *plainly* to tell us what they mean, by such an *odd* way of expressing themselves. But they have long since let the World know that all their care is to get *Words*; and for *Meaning*, they never think of it.

But *the Father* it seems is the Creator; nay, 'tis he that is *properly* the Creator: but then 'tis *by* the Son, and *through* the Holy Ghost. That is to say, *the Father is not the Creator*, much less is He *properly* the Creator, but the Son and Holy Ghost; and these two are *jointly* Creators. For if the Father created the World *by* the Son, and *through* the Holy Ghost; then the Father himself had no *immediate* Efficiency, or Hand in the Work, but only the Son and Holy Ghost: these were the *true* Creators of the World, and of all things. And besides that, the old Difficulty returns; namely, that the Son and Spirit divided the Work between them, each taking his part; or the same things must be created *twice*.

I know not how better to explain their Notion, of the *Father*'s being most *properly* the Creator, than by saying, he was just so (according to them) the Creator of the World, as King *Charles* I. built *the Royal Soveraign*, or was the Builder of *the Royal Soveraign*. For we say that King built *the Royal Soveraign*, *by* the Master-Builder, *through* the Ship-Carpenter; that is, *he built it not*, he only ordered it to be built, the Master-Shipwright (or Master-Builder) and the Ship-Carpenters were the Builders.

But if this be so, we are strangely misled by the *Apostles* Creed, which instructs us to say, that *the Almighty Father* is the Creator of Heaven and Earth, and is wholly silent of the great *Mystery*, that it was *by* the Son, and *through* the Holy Ghost. And the Scriptures do yet worse impose on us by an *unheard-of* Solecism and Impropriety, while they speak of these *two* (or *three*) pretended *creating* Persons, by the singular Pronouns *I, HE, THOU, HIM*, which in no Language are used, but only of one singular and particular *Person*.

They confound us yet more, if more can be, by telling us *only* (and *so often*) of the Creator, never of *Creators*, as Trinitarians would have us to speak. Gen. 6. 7. *Jehovah said, I will destroy Man, whom I have made.* Isa. 42. 5. *HE that created the Heavens,—— HE that spread out the Earth, HE that giveth Breath unto the People.* Nehem. 9. 6. *THOU hast made the Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens, with all their Host; the Earth, and all things therein; the Sea, and all that is therein; and THOU preservest them all; and the Host of Heaven worshippeth THEE.* This Text assures us there was no *dividing* the Work between two, or more *Persons*. It was one THOU who both *created* and *preserves* all things: and THEE, saith the Text, the the Host of Heaven worshippeth, not YE, not THEM, not more Persons, but one only. Isa. 4. 28. *The CREATOR of the Ends of the Earth fainteth not.* Rom. 1. 25. *Served the Creature more than* (Gr. besides) *the CREATOR.*

But what is not (really) found in Scripture for their purpose, Trinitarians know how to discover that 'tis there; which, with respect to the case before us, they do these two ways. First, by interpreting the Texts, which *by Confession of their ablest Criticks*, speak of *the new Creation*, (or Renovation of the World from Idolatry, to the Knowledg of the one true God) which was *by Christ*, concerning *the old Creation*, (or

the making of Heaven and Earth) which was *by God*. Secondly, They oft-times *honestly* add the word or words that were wanting on their behalf, which they have done in abundance of Contexts. But for both these Artifices (their Detection and their Confutation) I refer to *the brief History of the Unitarians*.

Of Original *Sin*.

" SOon after the Creation, *Adam*, the " first Man, transgressing the Law given " to him of not eating the forbidden Fruit; " he thereby incurred the Penalty of Death, " that was the Penalty annex'd to the Law, " which he had violated. But, first, he in- " curred this Penalty, not only for him- " self, who was the *actual* and *real* Offen- " der, but for his whole Posterity: God " *imputing* to them, or *reckoning* to them " his Offence, as if they had been the " Doers of it. Secondly, We are to know, " that in the word *Death* there is implied, " not only what is naturally and commonly " meant thereby, even the Separation of " the Soul from the Body, and the Body's " returning to Dust; but, first, such a Cor- " ruption and Depravation of our Faculties, " that we are all born naturally averse from " *every* good Word and Work, and inclined " to Evil *only*, and to *all* kinds of Evil. " *Then* all *Temporal* Calamities and Evils, to " which human Life is subject; and *finally*, " Eternal *Damnation*. All these are im- " plied in the words of the Sanction, *The* " *day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die*; and " they are by *Divines* commonly called the " three Deaths, or the threefold Death, " *Spiritual*, *Temporal* and *Eternal*.

" But we mean not to say, that the word " *Death* doth in its first or proper Signifi- " cation, import all the abovesaid Evils. " But it pleased God when He passed Sen- " tence on *Adam*, *to extend the Signification* " *of that Word*, which expresst and contained " the Penalty of his Law.

" 'Tis true, 'twould be cried out on, as " most unjust among Men, to reckon or " impute the Transgression of a Father to " his Children, and other Posterity; and " much more, if they were punish'd for it " in a far more extream manner than is " truly and indeed implied in the Penalty " annex'd to the Law that was violated; " that is, if the Word or Words of the " Penalty were *extended* and *strained* be- " yond their proper and natural meaning. " Yet these things cannot be unjust with " God, because He can do no Unjustice; " and the reason of that is, because *Things* " *or Actions are not just or unjust in themselves*, " *or in their own Natures, but only as God*, " *who hath all Authority and Power, either* " *willeth and commandeth them, or* (*on the con-* " *trary*) *willeth and forbiddeth them*.

The Notes.

This *Postulatum*, that Things or Actions are not just or unjust in themselves, or in their own Natures, but only as the Supream Authority and Power (that is to say, GOD) shall please to *will* or *nill* them, to *command* or *forbid* them, is indeed necessary to the Defence of such Doctrines as these, that God doth *arbitrarily* impute the Sin of *one* Man to *all* Men; and that in punishing those whom he hath made guilty by his meer *Will*, he infinitely exceeds the true proper and natural Signification of the Words in *the Sanction*, that is, of the words of that part of his Law, which contain *the Penalty* of transgressing it. That *Postulatum* is so necessary to this Doctrine of *Original* Sin, that it must be owned, that the *Calvinists* have judged better, and spoke more con-

sistently

sistently than their Opposers of some other Sects and Churches, who hold *Original* Sin as 'tis before described, and yet seem unwilling to allow of that only *Basis* on which (*Calvinists* have rightly seen) it will stand; namely this, that Just and Unjust, Good and Evil, are only the Will and Prohibition of him that hath Supream Power. But as the *Postulatum* is necessary to the Doctrine for which it was devised; so it as much destroys *the Eternal Rectitude and Holiness of God*, as the Doctrines in the foregoing Paragraphs, which have been already considered, overthrow the Unity, the Omnipresence, and other his Essential Perfections and Attributes.

It is horrible but to think that these Imputations on the most Holy God, are such, as would make up the *just* Character of *an Almighty Devil*. For if the Devil had Supream Power, what worse could he do, than *they feign* is done, by the Fountain itself of Rectitude and Holiness? Could he do worse than impute the Sin of *one* Man to *all* Men, and punish them for it, (*besides* and *beyond* his own Sanction) with an utter Inability to all that is good, *then* punish Inability (which was neither their Act nor Desert, and of which himself was the only cause) with Eternal Damnation?

Here many to help themselves a little, say, God saves *some* from this Ruine; he rescues his *Elect*, tho not from Sin and *Temporal* Death and Calamity, yet from *Eternal* Damnation; nay, bestows on them the unspeakable and everlasting Beatitudes of Heaven.

But this is no better than the other: For the highest Injustice to the far-greater number, is so far from being excused, by *an ungrounded Partiality* for a very few, that this latter may be truly called a *new* and *fresh* Instance or sort of Unjustice. Is it not *Partiality* and *Unjustice* too, to make a great number of Creatures of the same kind; and tho one deserves no more than another of them, either for Good or Evil; cherish one with whatsoever *Omnipotence* can do for him, and burn against the other with Wrath eternal and insupportable?

But they say, God having all Authority and Power, what He *willeth* must needs be Law, that is to say, *Justice*; and what He *nills*, or forbids, must be Transgression, that is to say, *Evil*, *Sin* and *Unjustice*. But from thence, it unavoidably follows, that the Devil wants nothing but *Supream Power* to legitimate all his Wickedness, and to change the nature of it from Wickedness to Goodness. If that Spirit had Supream Power, we must call him, as we now do, GOD, most Holy, most Just, most Righteous. And seeing God hath all Power and Authority, it would (on this Hypothesis) be in him *Righteous*, *Good* and *Praise-worthy*, if He were pleased to damn his most faithful Servants, to break the Covenant, and disappoint the Hopes of Life and Happiness, which he hath confirmed by his *Oath*; and (on the contrary) should think fit to save not only the most Godless and Impious Men, but the very Devils. These Consequences are unavoidable on the before-said Hypothesis, or Doctrine, that Things and Actions are not Good or Evil in themselves, but only by the Will of Supream Power; and they that *admit* of such Consequences, or cannot *decline* them, how can they be disputed with? But let us see what is the Doctrine of the *Unitarians* concerning the first Sin, or (pretended) Fall of *Adam*, and the Consequences thereof.

What Unitarians teach concerning the Sin of Adam, *and the Consequences thereon.*

WE *say*, when Almighty God had formed the Protoplasts, *Adam* and *Eve*, He forthwith declared them Proprietors and Lords of whatsoever is in the Earth or Seas. Gen. 1. 28. *Have Dominion*, saith God there to them, *over the Fish of the Sea, over the Fowl of the Air, and over every living thing that moveth on the Earth. And I have*

 given

given you every Herb, ——— *and every Tree.* *Adam* having thus received from his unspeakable Maker, such Marks of his Favour, was admonish'd withal, that he must remember he is *a Creature*, and has received of another whatsoever he *is*, or *hath*. Notwithstanding thou hast to deal with such a Soveraign, as will not require of thee *unreasonable* or *troublesom* Testimonies of thy Regards and Respects to him. See, the whole World is before thee, and it is all given to thee; only in this Paradise there is one Fruit, the Fruit of the Tree of Knowledg, of that thou art not to eat. 'Tis *the Obedience* that thy Maker requires of thee; 'tis the only Trial his Goodness is pleased to make of thy Love and Duty to him. If thou breakest this Charge, the Penalty is, that thy Life *presently* departs from thee; *the day* thou eatest thereof, thou shalt *die*; that is, shalt *return to Dust, from whence* as much of thee as is visible, and as thou art yet aware of, *was taken.*

It cannot be denied that this was the most *proper* of all Trials, the most *prudent* of all Commands. *Adam* could not be forbid to commit *Adultery* or *Fornication*, there being but one Woman, and she also his Wife; or *Murder*, because he had too much occasion for *Eve*, and she for him, to entertain such Thoughts; or *Theft*, for all the World was theirs. But he was *thorowly* tried by the Prohibition of the Tree of *Knowledg*, because of our natural Thirst of *Knowledg*, and the Ambition all have to be *wise*.

It is not necessary however to determine, whether the forbidden Fruit had indeed a Power to sharpen the Faculties of the Mind, Understanding and Memory? 'Twas sufficient for the Trial God designed to make of *Adam*'s Obedience, only to name or call that Fruit, *the Fruit of the Tree of Knowledg.*

There was nothing more just, than that *Adam* should be satisfied with the great Advantages he already possest; for all the Creatures, whether Animate, or Inanimate, were his; and he could not but be sensible, that his *present* Knowledg or Understanding was sufficient, both for himself and them. But *Adam* was perswaded by *Satan* to endeavour himself to make himself more like to *Elohim*, *i. e.* to the Angels and Spirits of Heaven, by the use of the forbidden Fruit. *Thou shalt know*, saith the Tempter, if thou follow my Counsel, *Good and Evil*; the meaning seemeth to be, Thou shalt know whatsoever Good and Evil is in every thing, by the use of this happy Fruit. He that forbids thee this Fruit, has confest its Virtue, in the Name he has given to it; why therefore has he forbad it to thee, but because he is *envious, jealous* or *morose? Ye shall not surely die* by eating this Fruit: for how should it be more mortal to you, than to the Serpent, and to so many other Beasts and Birds as daily gather it up?

Adam hearkens to these, and such like Reasonings, eats the forbidden Fruit, and thereby becomes obnoxious to the Penalty, even *present* Death.

But it pleased God to defer the threatned Punishment or Penalty, he deferred it for upwards of nine hundred Years, which seem to be Lunar Years, that is *Months*, notwithstanding what Dr. *Lightfoot* and others have urged, for such kind of Years as are now in use. Their Arguments are partly Mistakes, partly Inadvertences, partly groundless Conjectures.

But tho the threatned Punishment was not presently executed on *Adam* and *Eve*; yet the Wisdom of God did not think fit to incourage Sin, by wholly passing over this beginning of it. He punish'd *Adam*, and *caution'd* his Posterity, by cursing the Earth; that is, by causing it to bring forth Thorns and Thistles, *&c.* as well as profitable Seeds and Plants: so that *Adam* and his Descendents must now *Manure* and *Till* the Ground, if they would have a *regular* Harvest of Seeds and Fruits. Against *Eve* he pronounced, that whereas Conceiving and Child-bearing are naturally and necessarily both sickly and painful in some degree; yet both these should be more

trouble-

troublesome to her, than usual or natural. *I will GREATLY multiply thy Sorrows in thy Conception; and with Sorrow shalt thou bring forth*, saith the Angel who represented God, *Gen.* 3. 16.

The Holy Scriptures go no further than this, in the account they give of the Sin of *Adam*, and the Punishment and Consequences thereof, saving that they expresly contradict the Doctrine of Trinitarians, concerning a threefold Death, Temporal, Spiritual and Eternal, which was inflicted (they say) on *Adam*, and on all his Descendents for his Sin.

Where shall we look for the true Explication or Meaning of the *Penalty* or Punishment annex'd to a Law, but in *the Sentence* which the Judg and Lawgiver himself passes on the Offender? *The Law* was this, *The day thou eatest thereof* (of the forbidden Fruit) *thou shalt die*, Gen. 2. 17. that is, say the *Unitarians*, *Thou shalt return to Dust*; thy Life and Spirit shall leave thy Body, and be disposed of as shall seem good to thy Maker, who in Judgment always remembers Mercy. Let us now see in *the Sentence*, whether this was not indeed *the whole meaning* of these words of the Law, *Thou shalt die?*

Gen. 3. 19. *Dust thou art, and to Dust thou shalt return.* Here is the evident Declaration from the Mouth of the Judg and Lawgiver giving Sentence, what was meant by *the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt DIE.* And this Penalty, Punishment and Sentence was at length executed on *Adam*, tho he had the favour of a long Reprieve, a Reprieve of about *Eighty* Years.

Our Opposers can show no Context of Holy Scripture, in which their threefold Death (for this Sin) is contained; or in which the Posterity of *Adam* are said to have his Sin imputed to them, and that they are punish'd for it.

The only Offer they make is, from *Romans*, Chap. 5. the Apostle there (at *v.* 19.) saith, *As by one Man's Disobedience, many are made Sinners; so by the Obedience of one shall many be made Righteous.*

By one Man's Disobedience, say they, that is, by God's Imputation of one Man's Disobedience to them, (even *Adam*'s in Paradise) so many have been made Sinners. How much more *dexterously*, and *agreeably* to the Justice and Wisdom of God, *Pelagius* and the *Unitarians*? *By one Man's Disobedience*, that is, saith *Pelagius*, not as *Austin* has *newly* fancied, *by God's Imputation*, but *by our Imitation* of one Man's Disobedience, so many have been made Sinners: and on the other hand, *by the Obedience of one*; that is, *by Imitation* (not by Imputation) *of one Man's Obedience*, even the Lord Christ's, many shall be made Righteous.

Trinitarians make the same Blunder at ver. 18. *As by the Offence of one, Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation: even so by the Righteousness of one, the free Gift came* (or shall come) *upon all Men to Justification and Life.* Here again they see not, that *by the Offence of one Man*, and again, *by the Righteousness of one Man*, are not as much as to say, *by the Imputation* of one Man's Offence, and of one Man's Righteousness; but *by Imitation* of one Man's Righteousness, and of another Man's Offence, Justification and Condemnation have come upon all Men. We *die* for imitating the Disobedience of *Adam*; and we shall be justified and saved *for* and *by imitating* the Righteousness of the Lord Christ.

And thus it is, that St. *Paul* himself explains himself in this very Chapter, *v.* 12. *As by one Man Sin entred into the World, and Death by Sin: so also Death hath passed upon all Men; for that* (or, because) *all have sinned.* He saith not, as Trinitarians do, because *Adam* sinned; but *because all have sinned*, therefore Death hath passed on all; that is, all of us have deserved the Death we must undergo, or have undergone, by our own Sins.

But they say *Infants* die, and what Sin have they, unless you allow *the Imputation* of *Adam*'s Sin to all his Descendents?

But why do they not consider too, that *Beasts* die; is *Adam*'s Sin Imputed also to them?

them? They ought therefore to know, that Holy *Paul* in that Context is speaking only of *Adult* and *Grown* Persons: as for Infants, Beasts, and such like, that have not Sin; because they have not *Understanding* of Good and Evil, of Moral and Immoral; such die, because they have *Mortal* Bodies, liable to Diseases and Accidents. From which (Accidents and Diseases) to deliver and rescue them, it does not please God to Interpose, by an *Extraordinary* and *Miraculous* Power. For which sort of Providence towards them, divers *Probable* Reasons might be given: but being not Necessary or Proper to be here inserted, I omit them.

Of Partial *Redemption.*

" THE Transgression of *Adam* in Paradise, or his eating the Forbidden " Fruit, was in Him *Actual* Sin; in his Descendents 'tis called *Original* Sin: but the " Effects of it, are the same in Both; " namely, the before-mentioned three-fold " Death, or three Deaths. *Death Temporal*, which is the separation of the Soul " from the Body, and all temporal Calamities and Evils. *Death Spiritual*, which " is the Corruption of the Faculties, that " we are averse to *all* Good, and inclined " to *all* Evil. *Death Eternal*, which is the " everlasting Suffering of Body and Soul " in Hell-fire. These Deaths are *the Consequences* and *Desert* of *Adam*'s Sin; to himself, as the *Actual* Offender; to us, as " his Sin is *Imputed* to us by *the Justice* of " God.

" But the *Mercy* of God, and his *Wisdom*, have found out a most Gracious and " Glorious *Expedient*, by which to deliver " Mankind, though not from *Temporal* " Death, yet (in part) from *Spiritual* " Death, and (wholly and altogether) from " Death *Eternal*.

" But before we speak more particularly of the *Expedient*; 'tis necessary to " caution *Learners*, that they fall not into " this Error; that God designed the Benefit of the Expedient, for *All* Men and " Women. For when we say, Mankind, " or *all* Men have been Redeemed, from " the before-mentioned Deaths; our meaning is, that *the Elect*, (or as that most " consider'd and weigh'd 17*th* Article of " the *English* Church speaks) *Those whom* " *God hath chosen out of Mankind, are* (as " that Article farther says) *brought to everlasting Salvation, as Vessels of Honour.* " *These are called, according to God's purpose,* " *in due Season; his Spirit working in them.* " *And they, through Grace, obey that Calling.* " These *Elect* are a definite, certain, and " unalterable Number, that can neither be " increased, nor diminished; as is Expressly, and in words declared, by *the Suffrage* " of the Divines of *Great Britain*, at the " Synod of *Dort*; *Suffrage*, p. 9. It is " (saith the same *Suffrage* at p. 43.) for *the* " *Elect* that Christ died; that He might " *Effectually* obtain for them, and *Infallibly* " bestow on them, both Remission of Sins, " and Salvation.

" If the Unskilful ask here; How this " Doctrine agreeth with those Declarations " of Holy Scripture, so often repeated; " which seem to say, that Christ died for " the Sins of *the World*, or for *All* Men? " The Divines (abovesaid) answer at " *p.* 47. Here it is, that the secret Decree " of Election sheweth it self: inasmuch as " the Price was indeed payed for All, yet " is not Beneficial to All; because All have " not *the Gift* of fulfilling the Condition of " the Covenant. They mean; All have " not *Saving Grace* given to them, whereby " to *Believe*, and to *Obey* the Gospel. They " rightly

" rightly add, at *p.* 55. We no where " meet in Scripture any Promise, by which " God hath bound himself to impart his " Grace to *All* and every One.

" Farthermore, the same excellent *Suffrage* teaches, at *p.* 27. that 'tis a Supposition without any good ground, that all " *Infants* are saved. It saith, that those " Infants who are saved, are saved by virtue of their Election; which respecteth " not *the Age* of Persons, but only looketh " upon the common heap of *Fallen Mankind*, " out of which it chooseth.

" And concerning such Choosing or Election, it teaches, at *p.* 34. that *Grace* " doth find some whom it Adopteth, out " of *the most Wicked*, and at their *last End*; " while *Many* who seem *less Guilty*, have no " part in this *Gift*.

" Therefore when *All* are said to be Redeemed; or when 'tis said, Christ died " for *All*, or such like Expressions are used; " this is to be understood of *All sorts*, or " orders of Men and Women. He died " for High and Low, for Old Men and Infants, for Youth and Middle-age, for " Rich and Poor, for Wise and Unwise; " for *all these sorts*, for some particular " Persons of *all* these; for such of *all* these " sorts as are Elected.

" And those whoever they be, who extend any farther than this, the Redemption purchased by Christ, are *Arminians*.

" But *Arminianism* is only a Limb of *Socinianism*; as a Map of a Province or Kingdom, is but a Limb of a Quarter-map, " or of a Map of the whole World. For " *Arminians* have borrowed, all they have, " both Doctrine and Argument, from the " *Socinians* or *Unitarians*. And for that " reason, it must be farther said, that Such " as extend the Redemption by Christ, beyond what is above declared, are (so farforth) *Socinianiz'd*, have departed from " the Articles of the *English* Church, and " from *the Suffrage* of the *British* Divines at " *Dort*.

The Notes.

They tell us, that God so Imputed the single Transgression of *one* Man, to *all* Men, as to make *all* Men thereupon obnoxious to the Three Deaths, Temporal, Spiritual and Eternal: but that soon *Repenting* him of this Rigour, he took up *a Contrary* Resolution, even to Redeem *all* Men. Well, do they hold of that Mind? For if they do, 'tis no very Hurtful *Tragi-comedy*; because however Unjustly *all* Men were Condemned, yet if they are *all* Pardoned, they have been more *Scared* than *Hurt*. But the Matter (it seems) is otherways; for when God resolves to Redeem *all* Men, the meaning is, he intends to Redeem *Some*; and farther in Electing or Choosing those *Some*, his Election oft-times is from *the most wicked*; and those also, at their *last End*, or when they have sinned as long as they can. In a word, of those Few whom God is pleased to Redeem from that Ruine, which his Imputation of *Adam's* Sin to them brought on them; he chooses, They say, the *least Worthy* for Objects of the *Highest* Mercy, and exercises the uttermost Unjustice and Cruelty, on those that are Better, or however *not so bad*.

Let us consider these two Notable pieces of *Orthodox Doctrine*.

1. God hath Elected to Salvation, and has Redeemed only *Some* of those Many, who were undone by his Imputation of another Man's Transgression to them.

Now though *Unitarians* deny there was any need of a Redeemer, to rescue us from *Adam's* Transgression, or the Punishment thereof; because neither could that Transgression be Imputed to us, nor could we be justly Punish'd for it; yet, on other accounts, we own there was need of a Redeemer. As, to reconcile the World to the one True God, from whom they were departed by an Universal Idolatry; and to reconcile God to the World, for that, and *Other* Actual Sins, and divers other Reasons.

But

But we say also, that whatsoever was *done* or *suffer'd* by Christ the Redeemer or Saviour, was equally done *for all* Men and Women, none excepted.

We deny not that Holy Scripture speaketh of *the Elect*; but we say, it means not thereby, some few certain Persons chosen out of the rest of Mankind, to Eternal Life, while all others are doomed to Damnation, or left in an incapacity of Salvation. But *the Elect are all Such as turn to God:* all such are by him Elected, that is, *chosen and designed for Salvation*; and he would have all Men and Women to be of that number; if they are not, it proceeds from their own Negligence or Wilfulness, not from *Adam*, much less from God.

This is most clearly the Doctrine taught in Holy Scripture; even, that the Redemption by Christ, is intended for *All*; John 6. 51. *The Bread which I give*, saith our Saviour, *is my Flesh: which I give for the Life of the WORLD.* The *beloved* Disciple saith, the Lord Christ *was a Propitiation for our Sins, and not for ours only, but for the Sins of the WHOLE World*, 1 John 2. 2. St. *Paul* to the *Romans* saith; *By the righteousness of one* (even the Lord Christ) *the free Gift is come upon ALL Men, to Justification of Life*, Rom. 5. 18. The Author to the *Hebrews* saith; *By the Grace of God, Jesus Christ hath tasted death for EVERY Man*, Heb. 2. 9. Or if they want a Text, wherein the very word *Imputed* is found; St. *Paul* saith, *God by Christ reconciled the WORLD to himself, not Imputing their Transgressions to them*, 2 Cor. 5. 29.

To tell us Here, as our Opposers do, that the *WORLD*, the *WHOLE* World, *ALL* Men, *EVERY* Man, are only *some* Men; and those also a very *Few:* what is it, but to give us *a Flat* denial of Scripture; instead of *an Interpretation* thereof? And I will Here leave it, with the unprejudic'd Considerer; whether these Texts do not sufficiently prove this part of the Damnable *Socinian* Heresy. But they say farther.

2. In choosing or electing out of the heap of *fallen* Mankind; God's Election or Choice is sometimes from among *the most wicked*, and those also at their *last end*, or after they have sinned as long as they can.

The next thing that we may expect from some Men, is, that they will write a *Panegyrick* in Praise of the Devil.

If they had said, that the Election for which they contend, is made by the Devil, or falls upon Persons by chance of the *Dice*, it had been credible, that Redemption and Salvation is *the chance* of *the most wicked*, and at their *last end*. But to say People are *elected* to Salvation, and that by God; and yet that they are *the most wicked*, and at their *last end*, who are elected and saved, is not said without such manifest Impiety, that I will not now stand to dispute against it, but leave it with every sincere Lover of God, to judg betwixt us and our Opposers.

But this one thing I will observe, that when they were loading their Maker with such scandalous Imputations; they should have so contrived their *Calumnies*, as to be self-consistent, and not contradictory to one another, as they are in this Article. For of what *worst* or *worst* Men and Women elected to Salvation do they dream, when themselves have before assured us, that the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin to us makes All averse to *all* Good, and inclined to *all* Evil? Of such Persons there is neither *worse* nor *worst*, but all are bad alike: so bad, that Satan himself neither is nor can be worse. If we all have such an Inclination to Evil *only*, and to *every* kind of Evil, as is neither restrained nor corrected, but by an *extraordinary* and *particular* Grace of God; it unavoidably follows, that all are bad alike; and that 'tis a Contradiction to say, the worst or *the most wicked* are chosen to be Subjects of the Grace of Redemption, and of a Pre-eternal Election.

'Tis no manner of Evasion here to say, that *the Restraining Grace* which God bestows (more or less) on every Person, even on the Reprobate, hath several degrees: and from hence it comes to pass, that some

some are not *so bad* as the rest. For seeing 'tis not their own *Choice* or *Act*, but merely the *Momentary* Grace blown into them, that restrains any from any sort of Wickedness; it can no more be said of such, that one is better, or *less bad* than another, than a *chained* Lion can be said to be tamer, or *less fierce*, than a Lion who is *loose*, and *at full liberty*.

Of the Satisfaction.

" When the Divine Wisdom and " Goodness had determined to redeem *all* Men; that is, some of *all sorts*, " and of *every Order* of Men, from the " damning Imputation of *Adam*'s Transgression to them: to this end, it was ne" necessary that a full Reparation should " be first made to the Blessed Trinity for " that Transgression of *Adam*; and that a " Punishment, *equivalent* to the Punishment " or threefold Death, which *Adam* had " drawn on himself and on his Posterity, " should be undergone by some Person or " Persons, in the stead and place of *Adam*, " and his Descendents.

" It is true, there is no such *Vindictive* " *Justice* in God, that He could not by his " *Mercy* forgive this Transgression, or any " other: but in the case before us, God is " to be considered as *a Righteous Governour*, " who would not suffer his Law to be de" spised and violated, without a full *Satis*" *faction* to his Honour and Justice by the " Offenders, or some other on behalf of " the Offenders. For this reason it was, " that 'twas necessary to find out a Person " or Persons, who should undergo the " threefold Death for Mankind, or other " ways make an *Equivalent* to the Justice " of God.

" The Person undergoing the Punish" ment, or the Equivalent, must be a " Righteous Person, else he would need " one to satisfy for himself. Nay, he must " be a Person of *Infinite* both Merit and " Dignity, else he could not merit Heaven " for so many; nor could his Sufferings " be accepted instead of so many as were " obnoxious, and obliged to undergo the " threefold Death.

" The *Expedient* therefore at length re" solved on by the Blessed Trinity, for the " Redemption of Mankind, was this, That " *a Righteous* Person, of *Infinite* Dignity and " Merit, should be substituted to the Punish" ment deserved by Sinners, in the room, " stead and place of Sinners.

" This was judged more agreeable to " the Majesty of God, as Governour of the " World, than *either* to forgive to *Adam* " his Transgression, and to his Descendents " God's Imputation of it to them; *or* than " to inflict on him or them any *less* Punish" ment (as suppose some Temporal Cala" mity) than the threefold Death. Which " thing God might have done, either by " his Mercy, as a Maker and Father, or by " his Authority and Prerogative, as a Sove" raign and Governour.

" 'Tis true, there is a wonderful depth " of Mystery, never to be fathom'd by Hu" man Understanding, in this manner of " proceeding. And Human Wisdom would " (without doubt) have chose, either to " *forgive* the Sin, or to *abate* somewhat " of the Punishment, rather than have " substituted in the room of the Wicked " and Worthless, a Person *infinitely* Righ" teous and Worthy, even tho such Per" son should be supposed to have offered " himself to the Punishment. *But my* " *Thoughts are not your Thoughts, neither are* " *your Ways my Ways, saith the Lord.* Isa. " 55. 8.

The Notes.

In their Doctrine of *Original* Sin, our Oppofers feign, that Almighty God imputes the *one* Sin of *one* Man to *all* Men, and concludes them thereupon under the threefold Death, or *three Deaths:* but in this Doctrine of *the Satisfaction*, they tell us of a *contrary* Prodigy, that he imputes *all* the Sins of *all* Men to *one* Man; and what is yet a greater Monfter, lays on him alone a Punifhment *equivalent* to the three Deaths (Temporal, Spiritual and Eternal) of all Mankind.

We might call this the Trinitarians *Fetch-back*, if it were not, that the Interpretation they give of this Doctrine, is contrary to the Doctrine it self. One would think, if we might judg of their meaning by what they fay, that the Doctrine of *the Satisfaction* made a compleat Amends for the Doctrine of *Original* Sin; that is, that the (fuppofed) Satisfaction by Chrift did (as it were) *fetch back* the Damage and Loffes occafioned (they fay) by the Sin of *Adam*. But 'tis not fo: for tho (they fay) the Redeemer was able to fuffer, and did actually fuffer *an Equivalent* to the three Deaths of all Mankind; yet (fay they farther) neither his Merit nor his Sufferings do any good but only to a few, that is, to the Elect.

As to the *Unitarians*, they moft thankfully and devoutly own, profefs and publifh, that the Lord Chrift underwent the greateft of Labours and Sufferings for poor wretched Apoftate Mankind. He made himself an Oblation, an *Expiatory*-Sacrifice on the *Altar* of the Grofs for our Sins, to reconcile us to God, and (in fome refpects) God to us. But we fay, that his Labours and Sufferings on our behalf were not (as Trinitarians teach) defigned *as a Punifhment* laid on him in our ftead, becaufe *Punifhment is the Evil of Suffering, inflicted for the Evil of doing*; and the Lord Chrift having *done no Sin*, as the Holy Scriptures expreffly teach, 1 *Pet.* 2. 22. it neceffarily follows, that what he underwent, were purely *Labours* and *Sufferings*, not *Punifhment*. And for thofe Sufferings we fay further; it has pleafed God by way of Recompence, *highly to exalt him, and give him a Name above every Name*, Phil. 2. 9.

Nor was the Oblation or Sacrifice which the Lord Chrift made of himfelf, on our behalf, an Oblation made (as our Oppofers contend) *to the Juftice of God*, or by way of full Reparation to God's Juftice; but, as all other Sacrifices formerly were, an Oblation or Application *to the Mercy of God*.

For this Doctrine of ours, we judg the following Reafons to be fuch Proofs as muft needs be allowed, by every one that confiders them freely and impartially.

1. One Man could not poffibly be judged *an Equivalent*, for fuch an immenfe number of Sinners as were all of them obliged to be as righteous as he; and becaufe they were not fo, were liable to Punifhment; therefore it was not *to the Juftice of God*, that the Lord Chrift offered himfelf for thofe Sinners *as an Equivalent*, *but to God's Mercy*, by way of *humble fuit:*

2. If *one* Man can be conceived to be an *Equivalent* for *all* Men; yet if the Sufferings (or as our Oppofers fpeak, the Punifhment) he underwent, was not equivalent to the Punifhment due to them; then it muft not be faid, he tendred himfelf to the Juftice of God, but only to his Mercy, on behalf of the Offenders, and inftead of their Punifhment. The Punifhment, as well as the Perfon fuffering, muft be equivalent, elfe Juftice will refufe it; but Goodnefs or Mercy may admit of it. But now, who fees not that the *Temporal* Sufferings and *three days* Death of the Lord Chrift, were far from being equivalent to the Death Temporal, Spiritual and Eternal, of fo much as *one* Man.

3. Unitarians will never detract from the Dignity of our Saviour's Perfon; they acknowledg with the Scriptures, that *God was with him*; nay, *God* (by his Spirit) *was in him*. But if they could alfo add, as Trinitarians do, that the Humanity of Chrift was one Perfon with God; yet feeing only the

the Humanity could suffer or die; and seeing no Union of a Man with God, can exalt *Humanity* to be *Divinity*, or make that to be *Infinite* which of its own nature is *Finite*; therefore the Temporal Sufferings and three days Death of a meer Human Nature, cannot be equivalent to the Death Temporal, Spiritual and Eternal, which is *an Infinite* Punishment, of all Mankind, no nor of one Man.

4. But if it were admitted that *one* Man was so *dignified*, by the Inhabitation of God in him, as to be an Equivalent for all Men; admitting also, that the three days Temporal Death of such a Man, amounts to as much as the Deaths Temporal and Spiritual, and the Eternal Damnation of all Mankind: What will follow hereupon? It will follow, that God is obliged in Equity, to release all Mankind from all the three Deaths, Temporal, Spiritual and Eternal; else He hath received an Equivalent on behalf of Mankind, without discharging those for whom He received it; which is contrary to *Equity*, nay, to *Justice*. For *in Equity* an Equivalent ought to discharge the Person, whether he be *Offender* or *Debtor*: but if the Equivalent be not only tendred, but accepted also on behalf of the *Debtor* or *Offender*, the Offender hath Wrong done him, if he is not immediately discharged of his Punishment, and the Debtor of his Debt. But do Trinitarians pretend, or dare they, that God doth discharge Mankind from the three Deaths, on the Oblation and Sacrifice of himself, made by the Lord Christ on their behalf? By no means, they own we are not *at all* discharged from Death Temporal, but *in some part*, from Death Spiritual, and only *a few Persons* from Death Eternal: It follows, that the Sufferings and Death of our Saviour were not indeed an Equivalent to the three Deaths of Mankind.

5. To add now no more. The Unitarian Doctrine is consistent, nay, is the very same with what the Scriptures every-where say; namely, that Almighty God of his Grace, *the Riches* and *Abundance* of his Grace and Love, has *pardoned* Offenders for Christ's sake, on the Conditions on their part, of Faith, Repentance and Newness of Life. But the Trinitarian Doctrine, which saith, the Punishment laid on the Lord Christ, was truly equivalent to the Punishment due to all Mankind; doth deprive God our Maker and Father, of the Glory of his *Pardoning Grace and Mercy*. Nay, it saith in effect, that we are not beholden to God our Father on that account. It saith, he hath been harsh, nay, hath been apparently unjust, in that he hath received more than an Equivalent for our discharge from the three Deaths; and yet he hath not *wholly* releas'd any, and but very few are *at all* released.

I will only add; Whereas Trinitarians call the *Sufferings* of the Lord Christ a *Punishment*, and will have that Punishment to be equivalent to the Infinite Punishment due (they say) to Mankind for Sin *Original* and *Actual*; and whereas they call this Doctrine, *the Doctrine of the SATISFACTION by the Lord Christ*; they have mistaken in the Name, as well as in the Thing. 'Tis the Unitarians who, in proper speaking, hold that the Lord Christ made *Satisfaction* to God for Sin, not Trinitarians. We say, that the Sufferings of the Lord Christ not being equivalent in the *exact* Scales of *Justice*, for what all Mankind have deserved, yet God was *satisfied* with them; that is, was *graciously* pleased to accept them, as an Intercession on our behalf; and this is the proper Notion of *a Satisfaction*. But Trinitarians, in saying the Sufferings of Christ were *equivalent* to the Demerit of our Sins, were a full Payment to the Justice of God for them, do not hold a Satisfaction, but *a Reparation*, or *Plenary Amends*. The more elegant *Latinists* call *Confession*, *Deprecation*, and such like imperfect and partial Reparations and Payments, by the Name of *Satisfactions*.

Of the Incarnation.

"Because no other but a Person of *Infinite* Merit and Dignity could satisfy "the Divine Justice for *Adam*'s Transgression; therefore the second Person of the "Blessed Trinity, called *the Son*, offered "himself to undergo *the Equivalent* to that "Punishment, or threefold Death, which belonged to *Adam* and his Descendents: and "this Offer was accepted by the other two "Persons of the Trinity. It was agreed "that *the Son* should become incarnate in an "Human Nature, should be *Whole and All* "united to a Finite Man, even the Man "Christ Jesus, and be one Person with him. "By this means the Man Christ Jesus became of that unspeakable Merit and Dignity, that one drop of his Blood was an "Equivalent to the Eternal Punishment "of all Mankind in Hell-Fire; and his Holiness, and the Merit thereof, was infinitely "more than enough for himself, it was "meritorious of Heaven for never so many "Sinners.

"The Son was so incarnate in a particular "Human Nature, as to be *personally* thereto "united in the very Womb of the Virgin "*Mary*: so that *Mary* (as General Councils "of the Orthodox have rightly defined) "was not only Χριστοτόκος, or *Mother of Christ*; but Θεοτόκος, *Mother of God*.

"This Incarnation of *the Son* in the Man "Christ Jesus, begets also such *a Communication of Idioms* (that is, of Properties and "Attributes) between the Divinity and the "Humanity of the Lord Christ; that we "must say on the one hand, *God was born*, "God *suffered*, God *died*; as we must say "also (on the other hand) the Man Christ "Jesus is *Eternal*, *Omnipotent*, *Omnipresent*, "*Creator* of Heaven and Earth. As all "*Learned* Divines acknowledg, and Cardinal "*Bellarmine* in particular, has largely proved "from *Fathers* and *Councils* of the Orthodox. *Bellar. de Christo*, l. 3. c. 9.

The Notes.

The Doctrine of the Incarnation claims the place of all the Trinitarian Doctrines, even of the Trinity it self, in regard of its *Seniority*. For while our Opposers were only *Homo-ousians*; that is, believed and professed only *two* Eternal and *Consubstantial* Persons, not having yet *dreamt* that the Holy Spirit is God; in the days of the first *Nicene* Council, even then they held the Incarnation of the second of those Persons. Neither does this Doctrine come behind any of their Doctrines, either in the Number, or the Rarity and Strangeness of its Wonders and Mysteries: but of these, three are more remarkable than the rest. I will make a short Reflection on each of them.

The first Wonder is, that an Infinite Person is whole and all incarnate in a Finite Nature.

Which amounts to this, That *Infinite is less than Finite*; for else how should Infinite be incarnate, that is, *cased* in the Finite? But make the greatest Allowances possible, yet the Infinite which is whole and all incarnate in the Finite, can (at most) but be commensurate to the Finite; that is, but equal to it. Now these are two such Paradoxes, that till our Opposers can separate them from their Doctrine of the Incarnation, they will never perswade that Doctrine to any who make use of their Reason and Consideration.

The second great Mystery or Wonder of this Doctrine is, that the particular Human Nature, in which a Person of the Trinity vouchsafed to be incarnate, became thereby of *Infinite* Dignity and Merit, (for 'twas an Equivalent for an *Infinite* number of Men, and for the *Infinite* Punishment due to them) and yet still remained and continued a meer and bare Human Nature.

Which

Which is to say, a meer Human Nature continuing and abiding a bare and meer Human Nature, is a Divine Nature. For in affirming it hath *Infinite* Dignity and Merit; how much soever they may say in *words*, 'tis a bare and meer Human Nature; they have *in sense* affirmed 'tis a Divine Nature. For what is *Divine*, but as much as to say, *of Infinite Dignity, and Infinite Excellence or Merit?*

The third Wonder is, That by Virtue of the Incarnation of a Divine Person in an Human Nature, the Divine Person (or God) must be said to have been *born* in Time, to have *suffered* and *died*; and on the contrary, the Humanity, or Man Christ Jesus, must be said to have been from all Eternity, to be Omnipotent, Omnipresent, Creator of all things, and whatsoever else is said of God.

But that our Opposers may not complain that they are misrepresented, I must own, this is only *the fore part* of the Prodigy; the other end, or *hinder part*, is of a contrary Nature. For tho you must *say* God was born, God suffered, God died; yet (saith their Doctrine farther) you are not really to *think* God can be born in Time, can suffer, or can die: and on the other hand, you must *say*, the Man Christ Jesus was from all Eternity, created the World, is Omnipresent and Omnipotent; but you are not so to *think*. The reason is, because the Communication of the Properties of the Divinity to the Humanity, and of the Humanity to the Divinity, is not *real*, but only *nominal*, or in words.

Now Unitarians being but *plain* Fellows, and having *Country* Consciences, like not this juggling, that we must *say* one thing, and must *think* or mean another. Yet because we ought to yield to hard things for *Peace* sake: if our Opposers are content that we may do so also in the other Articles; that is, if they are content that we only *say* as is said in those Articles, and may declare at the same time that we *think* the contrary; and if Trinitarians will also so do in those Articles, we will comply with them in this third Wonder (or Mystery) of the Incarnation.

And this is the only Composition that can possibly be agreed to in these Controversies, without renouncing our Christianity, our reasonable Faculties and our Senses.

Of Grace.

" IT is true, the Lord Christ (God and " Man in one Person) paid down a more " than sufficient Ransom for the Actual De- " liverance of a thousand Worlds, from the " Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, and the Con- " sequences of that Imputation, even the " three Deaths; yet the Ransom was not " accepted for *all*, but only for the Elect; " nor yet was it accepted for Deliverance " from *the whole* Punishment, but only from " *part* of it, For no Man is thereby de- " livered from such a share of *Spiritual* " Death, as to be able to *do* a good Action, " or *think* a good Thought, without an " immediate and particular Assistance or " GRACE of God's Spirit, *beginning*, *conti-* " *nuing* and *perfecting* such good Action or " Thought *in* him, and *by* him. As hath " been often defined and concluded in the " *Councils* of the Orthodox, in opposition to " the Heresy of *Pelagius*, revived by *Uni-* " *tarians* and *Arminians*.

The Notes.

After they have tried their Skill in misrepresenting and deforming the true Idea we ought to have of God, and of his Perfections and Attributes: our Opposers proceed to *calumniate* Human Nature, *the Image of God*; and will have it to be *the Image of the Devil*.

They tell us, we come into the World so depraved in all our Faculties and Powers, that

that we cannot *do* any good Action, no, nor *think* a good Thought, without a particular and extraordinary Grace of God, *beginning, continuing and perfecting* such good Action or Thought *in* us, and *by* us.

In sober sadness, is this the Character of that sort of Creature, of whom the Apostle saith, *he is made in the similitude of God?* James 3. 9. Or is it the very Description of the Devil himself, if at least it be not a Calumny even of him? Will God own such a Creature as his Similitude, as has a natural Impotence to all that is holy and good, and a violent and perpetual Bias to Evil only, and to every kind of Evil?

Yes, they say our Likeness to God consists not in a Capacity to Holiness, or ought that good is; but in *the Dominion we have over some Creatures in this lower World.* But by this account of our Likeness to God, he that is *most of all unlike to God*, is much more the Similitude and Image of God, than Man is; the Dominion and Power of Satan is incomparably greater and larger than Man's is; therefore in their Hypothesis he is more the Similitude of God than Man is.

But as absurd as these things are, I will not now insist on them, but content my self to acquaint the Reader with some of the principal Reasons of the *Unitarians*, why they hold that Man is a *free* Agent, as capable of doing Good as Evil; nay, *more capable of the former*, because he *has more reason for it*, than of the latter; not the Slave to only one of the Contraries, but at absolute liberty towards both.

1. Our *Blushes* and *Remorses* for having acted at any time otherways than we ought, are Testimonies and Witnesses of our *certain* and *internal* Consciousness, that we could have done, as Religion and Duty require of us; that is, could have forbore that Evil, and have done the contrary Good.

2. *Deliberation* and *Consultation*, what and how we are to act, argue also, not only that we are *free*, but that we are sensible we are so.

3. We experience that our Piety and Vertue are our own Work, by the Difficulty we *feel*, and the slow Progress we are able to make in attaining those Habits, and in subduing the contrary Habits.

4. If Men are good, not by a spontaneous Choice or Power of their own, but only by an extraordinary and immediate Aid: no tolerable reason can be given, why we should not *always* be acted to Good, or why we are but *partially* and *imperfectly* Good? Is it credible that God should do his own Work in us, after a *desultory, inconstant* and *imperfect* manner?

5. What Piety or Vertue is it; or how can God love or esteem any Person, whether Him or Her, for that well-doing, or that abstinence from Evil, which was not their own *Choice, Will*, or *Discretion*, but the Work and Effect solely of God's *Grace*, acting *by* them, or *in* them?

6. That every good Thought and Action, is not an Inspiration, or the Gift or Grace of God, is confirmed by this; that God doth sometimes disallow and forbid some good Intentions and Actions of his Servants. Thus, 'twas a good Thought and Intention in *David*, that he would *build an House for the Lord*, a Temple for God's publick Worship and Service: 'twas so good a Thought and Purpose, that it was rewarded with a Promise from God, that God would *build* David's *House*, *i. e.* would establish and confirm his Family on the Throne of *Judah* and *Israel*. But as good a Thought as that of *David* was, it came solely from *David*, not from God; for in that very Context, (2 *Sam. Ch.* 7.) God disallowed and forbad it; declaring withal, that He had reserved that Work for *Solomon* the Son of *David*. No one will be so *unchristian*, as to deny, that 'twas a good Thought and Action in St. *Paul*, and his Company, that they attempted to preach the Gospel in *Bithynia*: but it came from themselves, not from God; for the Text says, God suffer'd them not so to do, *Acts* 16. 7.

7. If our Case were such, with respect to Good and Evil, as our Opposers pretend; that is, if all the Good we do, and all the Evil we forbear, is only by *a daily, hourly and momentary Grace*, (for so they affect to speak) inspired, infused, or blown into us: The Words

Words of the Divine Law should be directed *to God's Grace* in us, not *to us*. But now this is not only not so, but the Phrase and Expression used in the Law or Commandment plainly supposes, that we can obey by our own proper Powers. Such (in particular) is that remarkable Text, at *Ezek.* 18. 31, 32. *Make you a new Heart, and a new Spirit; for why will ye die, O House of* Israel? *I have no pleasure in the Death of him that dieth; wherefore turn your selves, and live ye.*

8. Our Ability to Good as well as Evil, is evinced also by this, that God declares he will punish the neglect of Duty, and every evil Doer, after a most terrible and condign manner. This would be too apparently unjust and tyrannical, if himself hath so made us, that we cannot do that Duty, or forbear that Evil, without a particular and extraordinary Grace and Aid, which is in the Gift and Power of God only, and which he refuseth or omitteth to bestow on us. Our Opposers deny, that we can so much as *pray* for that Grace or Aid of God, by which to do Good and forbear Evil: for they say, the very *Affectus orandi, the Inclination or Intent to pray*, is purely the Gift of God. As for *the Word* and *Sacraments*, another means for obtaining God's Grace, we shall see hereafter, that our Opposers make *the outward* Word of no Efficacy, ascribing all to *the inward* Word, which is not at all in our Power; and in order to any Benefit by *the Sacraments* so called, they require a great many previous Graces which are only in the Hand of God.

So that after all their Subterfuges, Evasions and Shifts, their Doctrine concerning *Grace* amounts to this; God will punish Men eternally in Hell-Fire for not doing, and for not forbearing what 'twas not in them to do or forbear, without such *an extraordinary* Grace of God, as was wholly in him to give, and not at all in them to attain or get.

As to the Texts by them alledged to prove that all is done by the Grace of God, and that *we* are impotent, and averse also to *all* Good: They have been often told by the *Socinians* and *Remonstrants*, and in the Annotations of the excellent *Grotius*, how those Texts are to be understood. To them therefore I refer, without ingaging in so long and tedious a Digression.

Of the Word and Sacraments:

"NOW that *the Elect* may obtain the "before-mentioned Grace of God, by "which to *believe* aright, and to *do* that "which Good is, the Trinity have appointed *the Word* and *Sacraments*.

"A Sacrament consists of two Parts, *an "outward visible Sign, and an inward invisible "Grace or Energy*.

"The visible Sign of the Sacrament of "*Baptism* is *Water*; the inward *Grace* is *New "Birth*, unto Faith and Righteousness. By "this Sacrament even Infants are regenerated or *born again* by the Spirit co-operating; that is to say, Faith, Obedience, and "other saving Graces are conferred in this "Sacrament on (Elect) Infants.

"In the Sacrament of *the Supper*, the outward Sign is *Bread* and *Wine*; the inward "Energy, or Grace accompanying it, is, first "*Remission of Sins*; next, *the refreshing* and "strengthening our Souls in Faith and other "Graces. These things are amply and often "taught us by the *English* Church, both in "the publick Catechism, and in the Offices "or Forms of administring Baptism and the "Lord's-Supper.

"*The Word* is another appointed means of "Grace; but no one is to think that 'tis by "*Arguments* used by a Preacher, or by *the "Rewards* or *Punishments* held forth in the "Word, whether *written* or *preach'd*; or "such-like external and human means, that "our Minds are *savingly* convinced, or our "Wills and Affections *rightly* disposed. No,

"no,

" no, the inward and ineffable Word which " God himself speaks to the Heart, and " which towards *the Elect* accompanies the " Word preach'd or read, when and as oft as " God pleases; this is that only Word " which begets Faith, worketh Obedience, " and (in one word) that whole Renovation " or Change, which denominateth a Man or " Woman, the Child or Servant of God.

" And thus much is plainly and undeniably intimated in the Collects, and other " Prayers and Offices of our *English* Service-" Book, and is the known Doctrine of all " the Orthodox, of all indeed but *Socinians*, " and such as are (more or less) *Socinianiz'd*.

" The *English* Service-Book and the Articles are so clearly for these Doctrines, " that it hath occasioned this Declaration of " what may be meant when Men subscribe " to the Articles, Homilies and Service-" Book, to be favourably received, even " this, that Men subscribe (not to the Truth, " but) to *the use* of the Service-Book; and " again, they subscribe to the Articles, as *to* " *Articles of Peace and Communion*, (which they " will not publickly impugn in the station " of *Preachers*) not as to *Articles of Faith*, or " of absolute and undoubted Verity. This " is the sense in which (perhaps) *most* Men " now subscribe to the Homilies, Articles and " Service-Book, and which (upon occasion) " they declare to be the meaning of their " Subscription. But all such are reformed, " according to the Model, not of our first " Reformers, but of *Socinus*, *Arminius* and " *Episcopius*, whatsoever the Station may be " that they hold in the Church.

The Notes.

The Sum of this Doctrine is; tho we are so made by God, as to be by Nature impotent to *all* Good, and disposed to *all* Evil; yet to cure *the Elect* (tho not wholly, yet in part) of this corrupt and depraved Condition of our Minds and Souls, God has appointed the Word and Sacraments. Which are a sort of means, that work not by any *natural* Energy *of their own*, nor by any Harmony, Suitableness or Agreeableness to our Powers, Faculties or Natures; but by a *Theurgical*, *Telestick* and *Mystical* Operation. Which is to say, they work on our Minds as *Spells*, *Charms* and *Incantations* (and such like) obtain their (pretended) Effects; namely, by a *Praeternatural* Power, *extraordinarily* given to them by God, or by those Spirits that preside over such Affairs.

Let a Man in black sprinkle you with some of the Church's *Water*, or give you a bit of *Bread*, or a sup of *Wine*, over which he has pronounced the Wonder-working Words, prescribed in Mother-*Church*'s Ritual; tho *by Nature* you are as bad as the Devil, you shall presently be inclined to as much Good, as will save you from Hell, and qualify you for Heaven. And this no less certainly, if you are one of *the Elect*, for else the Churches *Incantation* produces only a Momentary Effect, and a false Appearance of Good: no less certainly, I say, than by tying *the Norman* Knot, you may gain the Love of the Person you desire, or by other Devices recorded in the learned Books (so Fools esteem them) of *Magick*, you may cause Hatred, raise Winds, and do a thousand other Feats, which have no more natural or real Agreement with those Causes that are said to produce them, than Faith and Obedience have with a bit of *Bread*, or with a sprinkling of *Water*. Therefore when St. *Austin* defined a Sacrament to be *the outward visible Sign of an inward invisible Grace or Energy*: the good *Father* should have considered, that this is the Definition of *a Charm*, not of *a Gospel-Sacrament*. For a Charm is a bare *outward visible Sign*, that has no natural or real Agreement with the Effect; and if the Effect prove for the good of the Person concerned, it may be called *the inward invisible Grace* of such Sign or Charm; as when the Effect is to beget *Love*, or such like. But if the Effect of the Charm be hurtful, as to *kill*, or such like, then it must be called *the Energy*, not the Grace of the Charm; as that *damning* Quality or Power which our Opposers impute

pute to the Sacrament of *the Supper*, when not received aright, cannot be called *the Grace* of that Sacrament, but only *the Energy*. So that let them turn themselves which way soever they can, they have turned the Gospel-Sacraments (as I said before) into Charms and Spells.

Now on the contrary, Unitarians think of the Sacraments *reverently*, not *extravagantly* or *superstitiously*.

They like not indeed the word *Sacraments*, because 'tis no Scripture-word; and because the *Criticks* have noted, that 'tis a very improper Term or Name, to denote the *Ceremonies* of Baptism, and of commemorating the Passion and Death of our Saviour. But they will not quarrel about words, if the Things signified be agreeable to Reason or Holy Scripture.

We think that *Baptism* was a Ceremony or Rite appointed by our Saviour, for divers most weighty Reasons; whereof this was the chief, to initiate or enter *Jews* and *Heathens* into the Christian Church. It was a very proper and significant Rite and Ceremony: for the washing and cleansing the Body in Water, doth very aptly signify that *Repentance*, and those Purposes of *Holiness* and *Purity*, which such as enter themselves into the Christian Church, or are born in that Church, should profess and practise. He that comes to be baptized, that is, to be *washed in Water*, doth thereby profess, he will in like manner *purge* his Mind and Conscience, and his whole Conversation from Impurity and Wickedness of all sorts, by delivering himself up to the Institution and Guidance of that Gospel, which was given by *the Father* (or God) as its Author, was brought by *the Son* (our Lord Christ) as the Messenger, and confirmed by the Holy Spirit (or the Power and Inspiration of God) by abundance of Signs, Miracles and Wonders.

Therefore according to the *Unitarians*, 'tis not this Sacrament that worketh ought in us, much less *renews*, *regenerates* and *changes* our Natures; but the Person who receives this Sacrament, is to resolve and purpose Renovation, Regeneration or Newness of Life. This Doctrine we learn form St. *Peter*, 1 Pet. 3. 21. *The like Figure whereunto, even Baptism, doth also now save us; not the putting away the Filth of the Flesh*, (*i. e.* not the meer Ceremony of Baptism, that is, of dipping and washing in Water) *but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God*. That is, if as our Bodies are baptized, or *wash'd* in Water, so also we purify our Consciences of all Disobedience towards God.

From this Explication of Baptism some have drawn these two Corollaries or Consequences.

1. That Baptism should be administred by *dipping* in Water; for by that, cleansing of the Body is effected, at least is intended and signified: but *sprinkling* doth neither *cleanse*, nor signify cleansing the Body, and so is very improper to signify *the Answer of a good Conscience*, that is, the cleansing the Heart and Conscience from Evil.

2. That no Person is capable of this Rite, but such as can profess and intend, the thing signified by Baptism, even a clean Conscience, and a new Life.

As to the Lord's-Supper, every one knows the mighty Wonders ascribed by our Opposers to this Sacrament. *Papists* say, the Substances of Bread and Wine are changed into the Substance of Christ's Body. *Lutherans* say, they are *consubstantiated* with his Body. The Church of *England* goes beyond the *Papists*; for she saith (in the Catechism) that *the Body and Blood of Christ are VERRILY and INDEED taken and received by the Faithful* (not by others) *in the Lord's-Supper*. This implieth such a Real and Universal Presence of our Lord's Body in the Sacrament, as far exceeds the *Popish* Transubstantiation; for *that* limits the Presence to only *the Substance* of Christ's Body, and excludes *the Accidents*; but this takes in *both*.

The *Unitarian* Doctrine concerning this Sacrament, is plain and simple. *We say*, our Saviour has told us the meaning of this Sacrament in those words, *Luke* 22. 19. *This do in remembrance of me*. And St. *Paul*,

1 Cor. 11. 26. *As oft as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death.* That is, you commemorate and represent the shedding the Lord's Blood, and the breaking his Body for Mankind.

But for the miraculous Effects and Consequences ascribed to the right partaking of this Sacrament, Unitarians can find them nowhere, but in the Books and Sermons of the *superstitious Admirers* (I might have said Idolaters) *of External Things.* 'Tis true, the Apostle blameth the *Corinthians* for receiving *unworthily.* But the *Unworthiness* was their *Drunkenness in the very Act of communicating,* that is, of commemorating the Death of our Saviour; and 'tis of this and the like Disorders *in the Act of communicating,* that he there bids them to *examine themselves,* before they presume to take the Memorials of their Lord's Death.

As for those words of our Saviour at *John* 6. 53. *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you,* and divers such-like Expressions in that Chapter, especially toward the latter end of it: 'tis certain, and agreed by the most Learned Interpreters, (*Papists* and *Protestants,* as well as *Socinians*) that our Saviour is not there speaking of the Sacrament of *the Supper,* which (when he made those Discourses) was not yet instituted, but of *believing* in him, and *imitating* his Example. *H. Grotius* hath very judiciously and learnedly, and very amply also proved this to be the meaning of that Context; and I believe hath satisfied as many as have carefully read and considered that part of his Annotations. Wherefore I refer to him, and the English Reader to the Paraphrase of the late Learned and Pious Dr. *Clagett.*

Our Opposers delight in *marvelous* Doctrines; therefore, as they pretend, that Faith and Newness of Life are effected by God in us, by Means so unsuitable to the Qualities produced, and to the Nature of our Souls, as *Water, Bread* and *Wine:* so they assure us farther, that the *written* Word and Word preach'd have no Efficacy toward begetting those Effects; but 'tis (say they) the *inward* Word, which (*sometimes, to some,* and *in some measure*) accompanying the Word *written* or *preach'd,* first *convinces,* and then *reclaims* Sinners.

For my part, I would gladly know what kind of thing an *inward Word* is; I had thought all *Words* had been *outward* Words, and that otherways they could not have been called *Words.* But be that as it will, Unitarians are well satisfied that the *outward* Word (as our Opposers are pleased to *Nickname* the Holy Scriptures, and the Word *preach'd*) is sufficient and effectual (by *the Reasons* it suggesteth, and the *Rewards* and *Penalties* it proposeth) to convince and reform our *Reasonable* Natures, and that *otherways they were not Reasonable* (*but Brutish*) *Natures.* This is not ours, but the Doctrine of Holy Scripture, and that in as express and clear Terms as can be devised. First, as to the Efficacy of *the written* Word, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. *Thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto Salvation.* Then for the Word *taught,* after St. *Paul* had said, Rom. 10. 14. *How shall they believe on him, of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a Preacher?* He makes this Conclusion at *ver.* 17. *So then Faith cometh by Hearing.*

And is it not indeed a very strange Paradox of these Gentlemen, that the Wisdom of God should make use of *a Means that produceth* (they say) *no Effect?* If the outward Word produceth no Effect in him that hears or reads, we might as well have been bid to *tell twenty,* in order to the getting Faith, and subduing our Lusts, as to hear and meditate of God's Word. And if that be indeed the case, 'tis very surprizing, that God should expostulate after such an angry manner with lazy and negligent Pastors, and should so heartily rouze up others, as 'tis undeniable he doth. Isa. 56. 10. *They are dumb Dogs, that cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber.* Isa. 58. 1. *Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy Voice like a Trumpet; shew my People their Transgressions, and the House of* Israel *their Sins.* 1 Cor. 9. 16. *Necessity is laid upon me; and*

woe unto me if I preach not the Gospel. What needed any thing of all this, if the outward Word is nothing; and 'tis only the inward Word (which is not in the least tied to the other) that only can and does produce the desired Effect?

About interpreting Holy Scripture.

" IF it be asked, how it comes to pass " that we differ so widely from *the Heretick*s about the Doctrines specified in the " foregoing Paragraphs, while both we and " they pretend Holy Scripture to be our " *Rule*, and the sole *Judge* of Controversies " and Questions about Religion? The Answer is at hand, even this, That Hereticks " being Men of some Wit and Learning, " and withal *carnal*, are hereupon puffed " up, are too proud to submit themselves " to God's *Revelation*, but only as bowed " and subdued to their *Reason*. But 'tis all " Mens Duty in a Clash between Revelation " and Reason, whether *real* or only *seeming*, " to submit Reason to Revelation, and not " subject *Divine* Revelation to *Human* Reason. " 'Tis unpardonable Boldness in any, to dislike the *express* words, or *evident* sense of " Holy Scripture, because our Reason cannot " fathom the *depths* of that Divine Book. " If I would believe the Doctrine there set " down, were it not for the Contradiction " made to it by Human Reason; I am not " a Christian otherways than in Name, if I " do not receive such Doctrine with *an implicit* Faith, without seeking to *elude*, or " to *correct* it by Reason.

" And it is upon this Hinge that all our " Controversies with these Hereticks do " turn, whether we are to follow *the express* " words and *obvious* natural sense of Holy " Scripture; or, whether we are to interpret Scripture by Reason, so as to fly " to a *Figurative* Sense, or even to a *Catachrestical* (*i. e.* somewhat *harsh*) Construction or Interpretation, rather than " admit any Doctrine that is contrary to " Reason?

The Notes.

Unitarians think that a *real* Clash between Revelation and Reason is an *absurd Supposition*; but if we must put that impossible case, we think 'tis clear, that Human Reason must needs be subjected to Divine Revelation. But where the Clash is only seeming, that is, where there are ways of reconciling them, as by so *interpreting* the Revelation, as to make it agree with Reason: we think 'tis as absurd to oppose (as Trinitarians do) these two Lights to one another; we think in that case we ought to use the Expedient of *Interpretation*. If the Interpretation must be made either by a *Figurative* Sense, or by somewhat *Catachrestical* (harsh) Construction, yet *'tis always better to strain Words than Things*; and there are particular Reasons why we ought so to do, in interpreting Holy Scripture, and all Interpreters (of all Persuasions) do it with Approbation of *All*. Yet this is a thing on which I will not here insist, tho it deserveth great Consideration; because this is not, as Trinitarians pretend, our Case or Quarrel with them; or *the Hinge on which these Controversies turn*. For we utterly deny, that *the express* Words, or *the obvious* natural Sense of Holy Scripture, are on the Trinitarian side: we never fly (in these Controversies) *to a Catachrestical*, or harsh sense; no, nor have at any time need of a *Figurative* Sense, as hath been sufficiently shown in *the brief History of the Unitarians*. Trinitarians indeed are forced to those Expedients. I do not call them *Shifts*, because 'tis plain, they must be sometimes allowed not only in interpreting Holy Scripture, but in all other Writers and Writings. But seeing them-

themselves are forced to use very often those ways of interpreting; especially in interpreting the Gospel of St. *John*, and the most part of St. *Paul's* Epistles, they have no right to object such kind of interpreting to Unitarians, if indeed we had occasion for it.

The CONCLUSION.

THese things have not been said, God is Witness, to *challenge*, much less to *affront* other Sects and Denominations of Christians, and least of all the Church of *England*. From which Church the Unitarians have not separated, as other Dissenters, for small and inconsiderable Causes, have done.

We place not Religion *in worshipping God by our selves*, or after a particular Form or Manner, but *in a right Faith, and a just and charitable Conversation*: We approve of known Forms of praising, and praying to God; as also in administring Baptism, the Lord's-Supper, Marriage, and the other Religious *Offices*; we like well of the Discipline of the Church by Bishops and *Parochial* Ministers; we have an Esteem for the eminent Learning, and exemplary Piety of the *Conforming* Clergy. For these Reasons we communicate with that Church as far as we can, and contribute *our Interest* to favour her against all others who would take the Chair.

We would not therefore be understood to be *Enemies* to the Church, or as seeking to undermine her. Our whole *Pretence* is this, to reform our FAITH *by the Rule of Holy Scripture, in consistence with evident* REASON. And *the design* of this Pretence or Endeavour of ours, next to approving our own Souls to God our Judg, is, to vindicate the common Christianity from the Insults of Atheists, or other profane Persons; to take from *such* all *just* Exception against the most holy and wise Body of Laws, that the World ever had or can have, *even the Christian Religion*. By making it appear to be a most *rational* and *consistent* System, as well in the *Credenda, the Things to be believed*, as in the *Agenda*, or *Things to be done*. We think this to be such a Design as ought not to be entertained with those *Jealousies*, and aspersed with those *Calumnies* and *Clamours*, that are every day raised against us, both by the Pulpit and Press.

We hope that the Reasons of our Dissent from the Church in these Doctrines, being once known, and well considered, and the Honesty of our Design in publishing them apparent; our Fellow-Christians will less regret our Difference with them about these Questions, and will at length acknowledg, that however we are mistaken, yet we are *well-meaning* Brethren.

Thou *Father*, who governest in the Kingdoms of the Children of Men, continue to us All, the Means of *rightly* knowing Thee, and of living up to the Precepts of the Gospel; that we may All at length receive of thee, *the Inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, that fadeth not away, reserved in Heaven for us*.

FINIS.

Of Worshipping the HOLY GHOST *expresly, as a Person equal to, and distinct from the* FATHER.

SInce the Doctrine of the Trinity, or of three equal Persons in one God, is not (as all confess) a Dictate of Nature or Reason, but is knowable or credible by means of Revelation only: and since all authentick Revelations acknowledged by Protestants are contained in Holy Scripture; and since the Proofs from Scripture of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost, are not direct and express, but consequential, it follows, that even upon supposition that he is in some sense God, yet he is not to be worshipped any otherwise, than in the one Person of God, or the Father, because there is neither Precept nor Example of any other Worship of him in Holy Scripture. But the whole Current of Scripture is for the Worship of God under that one Person of the Father, or God of *Israel*. Concerning the Worship of our Lord Christ I shall speak afterward.

For if the Holy Scripture does not teach us, both under what Names and Notions, Appellations and Attributes, to worship God, then it is not a sufficient and clear Rule of Faith and Worship in all things necessary, (as those Names, Notions, Appellations and Attributes are) as all Protestants hold it is: And if there be neither Precept nor Example of worshipping God under the express Name, Notion or Appellation of Holy Ghost or Spirit, as a Person distinct from God the Father; but all Instances run in a contrary Stream, then such Worship is a humane Invention, introduced into the Worship of God, derogatory to his Honour, (whose Prerogative it is to appoint his own Worship) and to the Sufficiency and Clearness of Scripture.

For since the Holy Scripture is (as I have said) the only Revelation we have, that there is a Holy Ghost, and what he is, it's altogether necessary that we ascribe nothing to him, but what is ascribed to him in that Revelation.

But here perhaps it will be asserted, contrary to what I deny, That though there is no Precept for worshipping God, under the Name and Notion of Holy Ghost, as distinct from the Father, yet there are some Texts of Scripture whence an Example of such Worship or Invocation may be drawn. For this they alledg, *Matth.* 28. 19. and 2 *Cor.* 13, 14. In the first of these Texts, the Apostles are sent forth to baptize in [or into] the Name of the Holy Ghost, as well as of the Father and the Son.

Answ. I can see no shew of Adoration in that Scripture: forasmuch as to be baptized in, or into the Name of any One, and to be baptized into One, is the same thing, as the Learned agree; and is manifest by comparing *Rom.* 6. 3. (where we read, *Baptized into* [or unto] *Jesus Christ*) with *Acts* 2. 38. *Be Baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ.* See the like use of these Phrases, *Gal.* 3. 27. with *Acts* 8. 16. But the Israelites (as the Apostle *Paul* says, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2.) *were all Baptized into* [or unto] *Moses, in the Cloud, and in the Sea.* By which is not to be

understood, that they worshipped *Moses* with Divine Worship, but they were oblig'd to give heed to what he taught and commanded them in the Name of God the Lord. So to be Baptized into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is, as it's explain'd in the next words, to be taught, and obliged solemnly to observe all things whatsoever the Father hath commanded by the Son, whom he anointed with the Holy Ghost and Power, or by those on whom the Son poured out the Holy Spirit, the Comforter or Advocate, and imports nothing of Adoration or Invocation.

Besides, it's not unusual in Scripture to join other Persons with God, as one Object of the Action that respects them, when yet that Action respects God in one manner as Supream, and those other Persons in another manner as Subordinate. Thus the Israelites believed the Lord, and his Servant *Moses*, [Marg. Heb. *In the Lord, and in* Moses *his Servant*], Exod. 14.31. *The People greatly feared the Lord, and* Samuel, 1 *Sam.* 12. 18. —*they cried, The Sword* [not Swords] *of the Lord, and of* Gideon, *Judg.* 7. 20. So being baptized into the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, does not respect each of them equally and in the same manner. For it's manifest, Believers were Baptized, that they might receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost; see *Acts* 2. 38.

The other Text in 2 *Cor.* 13. runs thus, *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all. Amen.*

To which I answer; 1. That this Passage has the Form of a Wish, and not of a Prayer. It's too obscurely form'd to bear the weight of an Instance of praying to the Holy Ghost: that Passage in *Rev.* 1. 4. is far clearer for praying to the seven Spirits that are before the Throne, which yet Protestants deny to be any firm *ground* for our so doing. As for the *Amen* here read, *Grotius* says, It is not in that old Manuscript which he makes much use of; and that it was added by the Church of *Corinth.* 2. The Holy Ghost is not here considered as God, for he is expressly distinguish'd from him. 3. Dr. *Hammond* would read it *Communication*, as the same word in 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The Communication of the Blood of Christ*, that is, the Blood of Christ communicated; and so the Communication of the Holy Spirit is, the Holy Spirit communicated be, or abide with you all. I know not how it consists with Reverence to the one God or his Word, to ground the Worship of another Person as the most High God, besides and distinct from him that undoubtedly is so, upon so obscure an Expression as this is; considering also that it has been in all Ages of Christianity the Custom of the Church to pray to the Father for the Communication of the Holy Spirit.

There is another Text alledg'd by some, as an Instance of praying to the Holy Ghost, *viz.* Cant. 4. 16. *Awake thou North Wind, and come thou South, blow upon my Garden*, &c. which is so frivolous, that I shall not think it worthy of any Answer. I find also that the 6th of *Isaiah*, compar'd with *Acts* 28.25. is urged to the same purpose. Whence they collect, first, that the same Person who spake to *Isaiah* in Vision, *v.* 8. is the Lord; and *v.* 3. the Lord of Hosts: the same is by the Apostle *Paul* said to be the Holy Ghost: and then it follows, that the same Holy Ghost is celebrated by the Seraphims, saying, *Holy, Holy, Holy*, &c. But the Answer is easy, for *Paul* saith, *Well spake the Holy Ghost by* Isaiah *the Prophet to our Fathers*, [to wit, when he inspir'd him in speaking or writing that Vision to the People] whereas God spake to *Isaiah* in the Vision: and so for different Reasons the same words are attributed both to God and to the Holy Ghost.

But now it will be vehemently urg'd against me, That the Holy Scripture revealing the Holy Ghost to be God, and that he is one of those three Persons, who are each of them distinctly God, and all of them one God, it's necessary in Reason, and by natural Consequence, that he ought to be worshipped under that Name, Notion and Distinction.

I answer, and deny that Consequence, for these

these Reasons. 1. Because we ought not to carry a pure Revelation by our Reasonings, (which are very fallacious) beyond the Extent of that Revelation; and we ought to measure the Extent of it by the Revelation it self, for otherwise we should readily run into many and great Errors, Superstitions and Contests, as by lamentable Experience is too too manifest by the Controversies among Christians, especially with Papists. But to go no further than the Case in hand: If all the Worship due to God upon any Account, and which we give to the Father because he is so, by the Name of the Father, be also due to the Holy Ghost expressly, because he is God, by the Name and Notion of Holy Ghost, as well as the Father, because, as the *Athanasian Creed* says, *We must give them equal Glory*; we shall be obliged to transprose, add to, and alter Scripture, and make it contradict it self in a thousand places; particularly, every time we use the Lord's Prayer, and in all Prayers, Praises and Adorations we make after that Pattern, instead of *OUR Father which art in Heaven*, we must say, Our Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which are in Heaven; and instead of *Hallowed be THY Name*, Hallowed be YOUR Name; *THY Kingdom come*, we must say, in consequence of our reasoning, YOUR Kingdom come; and so not THY Will, but YOUR Will be done; not THINE is the Kingdom, but YOURS is the Kingdom, *&c.* So when we worship, as the Apostle *Paul*, Ephes. 1. 3. we must not say, *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, but, *Blessed be God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* And so every where we must turn the Names of Father, God, Lord, *&c.* into Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; *Thou* and *Thee* into *Ye* and *You*, *Thine* into *Your*, &c. Thus making Holy Scripture a most unintelligible and absurd Book, or at least such as the Papists would have it, and nothing less than what Protestants hold it, the clear and certain Revelation of the Mind of God; and the New Covenant, wherein is promised—*all shall know me, from the least to the greatest*, infinitely more difficult than the old.

My second Reason why I deny that the Holy Ghost, supposing him to be God, is to be worshipped expressly as the Father, by virtue of our reasoning upon that Supposition, is drawn from the Reflection thereby cast upon all Holy Worshippers we read of in the Bible. For if the Holy Ghost be a Person of the most High God, he was so from Eternity, and had from the beginning of the Creation an equal right of being worshipped in as express a manner as the Father or *Jehovah*; but we find no Footsteps of any such Worship, wherein the Holy Ghost was distinctly worshipped, but *Jehovah* is always worshipp'd under such Names, Descriptions, Appellations and Pronouns, as import expressly one singular Person or personal God. And by him the Patriarchs, Prophets and Jews did understand and signify the Creator of Heaven and Earth alone, the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*; and Christians understood the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and not the Person of the Holy Ghost, any otherwise than as implied. Yea and our Lord Jesus himself, whenever he pray'd or worshipp'd God, did it under the Names, Notions and Descriptions which signify the Father, and in the singular Number; consequently all the Patriarchs, Prophets and Jews until Christ, and all the Believers in Christ, and Christ himself too, (which is Blasphemy to suppose) erred in their worshipping God, making no express mention of the Holy Ghost, if it be a good Consequence from the Holy Ghost his being revealed to be a Person of God, that we ought to worship him distinctly under that Name, or some other peculiar to him. For it infers, not only that we *may*, but that we *must* so worship him; for he that is equally God as the Father, has, according to our Reasoning, as much right as he to be worshipp'd and invocated expressly, and cannot be denied it by us without Transgression. But the Holy Ghost himself, the Inspirer of Holy Scripture, doth never dictate any such express Worship of himself; and therefore

the Argument in the Objection reflects highly upon him, as negligent of the Glory of God, even his own Self, and the greatest, not only Defectiveness, but Impiousness (pardon the word) upon the Holy Writings, which never teach the due and whole Worship of God, but only a part of it.

It is therefore to be held, that supposing the Holy Ghost to be a Person of God, he was always worshipp'd and invocated under the Name of *Jehovah*, the *Lord*, the *Lord God of Hosts*, and the like: And in the Times of the New Covenant, under the Name of the *Father*, *The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, *The Father of Mercies*, &c. but never, either under the Old or New-Covenant-Times, by the Name of the *Holy Ghost*, or *God the Holy Ghost*, or *blessed Spirit of God*, or any such Name as distinguishes him expressly from God the Father: Therefore such worshipping of him now is utterly unlawful, as reflecting Imperfection and Obscurity upon Holy Scripture, Error or Negligence upon all the Holy Men, Patriarchs, Prophets & Apostles we read of in Scripture; yea (which is not to be thought or said, did not the detection of a great Error enforce it) upon our Lord Jesus the Pattern of Perfection, and upon the Holy Ghost himself, by whose Inspiration the Scriptures were written, and holy Men moved.

3. The Worship of the Holy Ghost, in such an express manner as distinguish'd from the Father, does naturally beget in us the Notion or Idea of two Persons with two Essences, as fully as *Peter* and *Paul* are two Essences: neither do I think it possible to avoid it, for I cannot make either the Father, or the Holy Ghost, an Object of Worship as the most High God, but I must notion each of them distinctly as a Person and Essence compleat, and then of necessity I form in my Mind two Essences as well as two Persons, or else I worship the Essence twice under two different Persons: But whether the one or the other, I do expressly worship two most High Gods equal one to the other, whilst I have two such Objects under two different Names and Appellations, which signify as differently as Father and not Father, but one equal to him.

And now that I have shew'd, there is no Example, as well as no Precept, of worshipping or praying to the Holy Ghost by that Name, or any other Name or Appellation, signifying him as a Person distinct from the Father; and that such Worship is not to be justified by any Consequence drawn by our Reasoning from the Revelation of his being a Person of God; Yea, that it is unlawful so to do, I first turn my self to the Dissenters, and charge them with great Inconsistency to themselves and their own Principles; for whilst they refuse to join in the Liturgy and Ceremonies of the Church of *England*, because (say they) there is neither Precept nor Example in Scripture for such a Liturgy or Ceremonies, and reject all the Reasons the Church-men draw from Order and Decency, the Command of Superiours in Matters of Indifferency, *&c.* they themselves do daily worship, and that expressly by Names and Appellations, which infer different Idea's and Notions, a Person distinct from the Father, the only true God, without any Warrant of Scripture, either by Precept, or so much as one Example; nay, against the full current of Scripture-worship, with heinous reflection upon all holy Worshippers, yea, upon our Lord Christ and the Holy Ghost himself, and the unavoidable danger (in all the common People at least) of worshipping two Gods. Thus you can no longer plead the Protestant Principle, that the Scriptures are a perfect, clear, and our only Rule of Faith and Worship; and that nothing is lawful in the Worship of God, but what he hath either commanded or exemplified. You must not call the Liturgy and Ceremonies, *&c.* Will-worship, whilst your selves are Will-worshippers in the very Essence, Object and Form of Worship. Instead of one Person which God commands you to worship, saying, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before ME*, you have in daily practice chang'd ME into US, one into two Persons expressly. You must:

must not henceforth draw a Parallel between *Jeroboam*'s worshipping the God of *Israel* by Calves, and the Church of *England* worshipping God in consecrated Churches, Chappels, Cathedrals, Priests Garments, by Altars, Liturgies, singing Service, Litanies, Bowings, Crossings, Holidays, Fasts, Feasts, *&c.* because all these, and a great deal more, may be justified better than you can justify worshipping God by those express Names and Descriptions that make him plural, and not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ only; and that without any Authority, but merely of your own Heads. And this unscriptural Worship is so frequent with you, that you seldom make two Prayers, but one or both of them is concluded with the Worship of the Holy Ghost expressly, together with the Father and the Son. Nay, you are so addicted to this Worship of your own Invention, or rather Custom, that though there are many Forms of Worship and Doxology in Scripture, especially in the New Testament, for New-Covenant Worshippers, yet you seldom make use of any of them, but neglect them all, preferring your Popish Invention before them.

Particularly you Baptists, or Anabaptists, do worthily labour in the vindicating of Baptism to those that are capable of it, from those that are uncapable of it, whilst in the mean time you follow the most corrupt Tradition, of giving the Glory due to the one Person of God only, to another Person as his Equal.

On the other hand, I crave leave to address my self to the Church-men, (who are so frequently bragging of the purity of their Faith and Worship) and put them also in mind of their dishonouring God in this Point, whilst every Morning they read their Liturgy, they repeat Pope *Damasus*'s Doxology, at least seven, for the most part eight or nine times, sometimes fourteen or fifteen times, *viz. Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost: As it was in the Beginning*, &c. For the Learned in Antiquities tell us, that this Doxology was first devis'd to be the Cognizance of a Faction, and did produce tragical Riots and Tumults; then in the Year 376, it was taken into the Church-Service by Bishop *Damasus*, who was brought into that Office at *Rome*, by Tumult and Slaughter of above one hundred *Roman* Citizens. Now is not this a high Pedigree of a Form of Worship, that must thrust out, and be preferr'd before all those excellent Doxologies and Thanksgivings in Holy Scripture, inspir'd by the Holy Ghost. Such are these;

To the King Eternal, Immortal, Invisible, the only wise God, be Honour and Glory for ever and ever. Amen. 1 *Tim.* 1. 17.

There is a like Description of God, 1 *Tim.* 6. 15, 16.——*the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; Who only hath Immortality, dwelling in the Light which no Man can approach unto, whom no Man hath seen, nor can see; to whom be Honour and Power everlasting.* Amen.

Another in *Jude*, ver. 25. *To the only wise God our Saviour, be Glory and Majesty, Dominion and Power, both now and for ever.* Amen.

So *Rom.* 16. 27. *To God only Wise, be Glory, through Jesus Christ for ever.*

See *Gal.* 1. 5. *To whom* [God and our Father] *be Glory for ever and ever.* Amen.

And *Ephes.* 3. 20, 21. *Now to him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the Power that worketh in us; unto him be Glory in the Church by Christ Jesus, throughout all Ages, World without end.* Amen.

Phil. 4. 20. *Now unto God and our Father be Glory for ever and ever.* Amen.

1 Pet. 5. 10, 11. To--*the God of all Grace, who hath called us to his eternal Glory by Christ Jesus*——*to him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever.* Amen.

2 Pet. 3. 18. *To our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, be Glory, both now and for ever.* Amen.

Rev.

Rev. 4. 11. *Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive Glory, and Honour, and Power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy Pleasure they are and were created.*

Rev. 5. 12. *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing.* Ver. 13. *Blessing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power, be to him that sitteth upon the Throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever.*

See also 2 *Cor.* 1. 3. *Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Mercies, and the God of all Comfort,*

So 1 *Pet.* 1. 3. *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* So also *Ephes.* 1. 3. Thanksgivings are commonly rendred to God through Jesus Christ.

Now, Reverend Sirs, is it not unaccountable, that a Person equal to this God and Father, and who has an equal Right to all Glory and Honour, should never be mentioned? And, is it not as unaccountable, that a Church professing a most exact Reformation from Popish Traditions, in Faith and Worship, by the only Rule of Holy Scripture, should thus palpably derogate from Scripture, to the high dishonour of all sacred Persons and Things; and give your Adversaries the Romanists an Argument and Advantage, whereby they are able to defend the very worst of their Superstitions and Idolatries, and subvert your only Rule of Faith? If these Doxologies had not been found in Scripture, but devised by some eminent Bishop or Patriarch, you would certainly have counted it a great disrespect to that Bishop to pass them by, and take one devised by an ordinary weak Man of no Reputation, (supposing the Matter of it to have been lawful); But what is Pope *Damasus* in compare with the Holy Ghost, or even with the Apostles and Holy Penmen? You must no longer reject the Popish *Worship of Saints and Angels, the Images of Christ and his Mother, and other Saints; the Bread in Transubstantiation*, &c. because not found in Scripture, our only Rule of Faith and Worship; neither a thousand more of their Doctrines, Ceremonies and Usages, whilst you constantly every day, and often in every day repeat the Worship of another Person expressly, besides and in distinction from him that is the supream God, and together with him, whereby you cast great Contempt upon Holy Scripture, as an imperfect and defective Rule of Faith and Worship, even in the most Fundamental Point, the highest Object of Worship. The Papists are not wanting of Reasonings, Arguments, Consequences, for what they believe and practise in Religion: but you reject them because not found in Scripture. See what your most learned Defender says, in his Discourse of the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*, pag. 175. §. 16. " And " so (*saith he*) for all particular Doctrines " rejected by us —— We therefore refuse " the belief of them, because not con- " tained IN OUR ONLY RULE OF FAITH: " on this account we reject the Pope's Su- " premacy, Transubstantiation, Infallibili- " ry of the present Church in delivering " Points of Faith, Purgatory, and other " Popperies, impos'd upon the Belief of " Christians. Thus far he.

But in contradiction to this Principle, you believe it acceptable to God the Father, to worship expressly another equal to him: you can profess to believe that unscriptural, unintelligible and damning Creed of your Saint *Athanasius*, whereby you damn all that do not give equal Glory to the Holy Ghost as to the Father; and consequently your selves, for ye often pray to, and worship the Father expressly without mention of the Holy Ghost, nay, ye pray to the Father that he would give you the Holy Ghost.

Thus far I have discourse mostly upon that Protestant Principle named above; but now I will shew you that that your Faith and Worship is directly contrary to the *Precepts* of Worship in holy Scripture, and that not one only, but all of them. For all the Precepts as well as Examples concerning the Worship of God, respect him as one singular Person, both in Essence and

Person;

Person; for there can be no Person without an Essence, and one Almighty and most wise Person is one most High God: All Precepts of worshipping that God speak in the singular number of one such Person, and exclude every other Person whatsoever; and therefore even the Person of the Holy Ghost, considered as a distinct Person from the Father, and so exprest; for being exprest with the Father, they make two Gods, and then our Blessed Saviour could not with Congruity to Truth and Grammar, have expounded that Precept of God by *Moses* [*Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him*] thus; *It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and HIM only shalt thou serve*, Mat. 4. 10. for he that worships the Father alone expressly; worships the Lord his God; and he that worships expressly another Person besides him with equal Worship, worships no longer the Lord his God, and serves *him only*, but he worships the Lord his God and another, and serves THEM together; so our Lord's Precept and Form of Prayer directs to one singular Person, as I have shewed above, *p.* 3. And being asked, *which is the first Commandment of all? Jesus answered him, The first of all the Commandments is, Hear O* Israel, *the Lord our God is one Lord*, [or the Lord our God the Lord is one.] *And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, and with all thy Soul, and with all thy Mind, and with all thy Strength:* Where he makes the Oneness of the Person of God the very ground of all that Love, Worship and Service which we are able to perform, and which we can perform to one Person only; *Mar.* 12. 29, 30. with *Deut.* 6. 4, 5. I think I need not instance in any more. But you elude all Divine Precepts of Worship, and make them of none effect by your Tradition; for you have received a Litany from Pope *Gregory* I. which teaches you to pray, *O holy, and blessed, and glorious Trinity, three Persons and one God, have Mercy upon us. O God the Father of Heaven, O God the Son, O God the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son, have Mercy upon us.* So you change the Lord our God his great Commandment, repeated by the Mouth of our Saviour, into the quite contrary, *him only* into *them*, and the God that is *one* you make *three*, and serve *them* with equal Worship. And instead of that Doxology which our Lord taught us to form our Doxologies by, you have introduced this or the like Conclusion of *Gregory* and other Popes in above twenty Collects and Prayers, namely,—— *him* [Jesus Christ] *who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost now and ever*; first Collect in *Advent*, and in the third Collect thus—— *O Lord Jesus Christ* —— *who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Spirit, ever one God, World without end.* Amen.

But after all, it will be urg'd against me, that our Lord Jesus is often worshipp'd expressly together with the Father; and if he, why not also the Holy Ghost? To which I answer: 1. That there is a far different Consideration of Christ and of the Holy Ghost; for the Holy Ghost has no other Consideration in the Worship done to him, but that of God, or a Person that is God; but Jesus Christ has the Consideration of *the well-beloved Son of God, whom he has appointed Heir of all things, by whom also he made the Worlds, whom he sanctified and sent into the World; whom, because he humbled himself, and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross, God hath highly exalted, and given him a Name above every Name, that at* [*or in*] *the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow, and that every Tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father*; but no such thing can be said or thought of the Holy Ghost, who whatsoever Worship is paid to him, it redounds ultimately to his own Glory in Distinction from God the Father, and in Equality with him. All the express Worship to be exhibited to Christ, has this Ground and Foundation, namely, that the Father, even God, has given him that Power, Authority and Dominion which makes him a fit Object of that Worship,

and

and the Glory thereof is not terminated in him as in its utmost scope, but passes by and through him to the Father. Both these Considerations are clear and apparent in that Passage to the *Philippians*, which I have mentioned, and so in the Discourse of our Lord himself, *John* 5. for when the Jews who *sought to kill him*, v. 18. did maliciously interpret his saying, that God was his Father, to be a making himself equal with God, he denies with a solemn Asseveration, saying, *Verily, verily, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise.* And how comes that to pass? *For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doth,* (ver. 20.) *and he will shew him greater Works than these, that ye may marvel.* It was such a shewing which proceeded from the Love of the Father; and it was partly present, and partly future. *For as the Father raiseth the Dead, and quickneth them, even so the Son quickneth whom he will*, ver. 21. This is one of those Works which the Father shews him. *For the Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son, that all Men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father:* To wit, as they honour the Father upon the account of his judging; but doth this Honour terminate in the Son? No, *he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father that sent him.* That Honour which is given to the Son, ascends by him as sent to the Father that sent him, *ver.*26. *For as the Father hath Life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have Life in himself; and hath given him Authority to execute Judgment also, because he is the Son of Man*, that is, he that was prophesied of in the Visions of *Daniel*, where we read, that *one like the Son of Man—— came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him, and there was given him Dominion, and Glory, and a Kingdom, that all People, Nations and Languages should serve him*, &c. *Dan.* 7. 9, 10, 13, 14. or because he is such a Son of Man as humbles himself to the meanest and hardest Condition of the most ordinary Man: See *Phil.*2.7,8. Again, in *ver.* 30. of this of *Joh.* 5. *I can of my self do nothing; as I hear, I judg, and my Judgment is just.* Why, because he is the most High God? No, but *because I seek not mine own Will, but the Will of the Father which hath sent me.* These Reasons of Worship agree to a Man exalted by God, but by no means to him that is himself God already. Can he that is God the most high be made Higher than he is? God may and ought to be celebrated and praised for those Excellencies that are in him; but he can have no Addition to his natural and inherent Power, Authority and Glory. But the Apostle *Peter* also tells the People in that famous Sermon, Acts 2. 36. —— *Let all the House of* Israel *know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ.* And the Apostle *Paul* tells us, *Rom.* 14. 9. *For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.* Hence it is that in the Visions of the *Revelations*, chap. 5. where the twenty four Elders fall down before the *Lamb, and sing a new Song*, they exhibit that Worship to him, they do it not upon the account of his being the most High God, but upon account of his Worthiness as a Man, saying, *Thou art worthy——because thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy Blood out of every Tribe, and Tongue, and People, and Nation, and hast made us to our God Kings and Priests*, ver. 9, 10. So by the Angels, Animals, Elders, even thousands of thousands, Christ is celebrated upon the same account of his being the Lamb that was slain, saying, *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing*, ver. 12, 13.

This Observation of mine, touching the different Ground of the Worship of Christ from that of the Worship of the Father, or of the Holy Ghost (who are alway worshipp'd as Persons of the most High God) is so firm, that I am perswaded there is no place of Scripture can be alledged of any

Divine

Divine Excellency attributed to Christ, but it will plainly appear to have been given him by the Father, out of his free Love, or as a Reward of his Obedience. Thus in *Col.* 1. 16. where all things in Heaven and in Earth [not Heaven and Earth] are said to be created by Christ; he is said there to be, *The Image of the Invisible God, the First-born of every Creature*, vers. 15. He forgave Sins, but as the Son of Man empowred by God so to do, *Mat.* 9. 6, 7. And the Apostles tell the High Priest and Council, saying, *The God of our Fathers has raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a Tree: Him hath God exalted with his right Hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give Repentance to* Israel, *and forgiveness of Sins*, Acts 5. 30, 31. Christ is to be believed on, but so, as that he *who believeth on him, believeth not on him, but on another*; to wit, *on him that sent him*, John 12. 44. And so, that by and *through him we believe in God, who raised him from the Dead, and gave him Glory*, 1 Pet. 1. 21. He hath the Name of *Emmanuel* (God with us) given to him; yet he is so a God, that when he is so called, he also is said to have a God who anointed him, *Heb.* 1. 8, 9. He is said to be *the First and the Last*, Rev. 1. 17. but so, as *he that liveth and was dead*, ver. 18. He hath the Name of *The Lord our Righteousness*, Jer. 23. 5, 6. (if at least that Appellation doth not agree to *Israel* mentioned before) but however it is common to him with *Israel*, Jer. 33. 16. God only searcheth the Heart primarily, and of himself; but he can give to others an Ability to search the Heart, as to *Elisha*, 2 Kings 8. 12. So Christ saith, *I am he which searcheth the Reins and Heart*: But he speaketh there of a Revelation which God gave unto him, and of himself as executing Judgment upon Adulterers, and giving to every one a Reward according to his Works. But it is certain that Christ as a Man is Judg, as I observ'd before from *John* 5. 27. And the Apostle *Paul* saith, That God *shall judg the World in Righteousness, by that MAN whom he hath ordained*, Acts 17. 31.

My Conclusion from all is, That all the Worship that is or ought to be exhibited to Christ, according to Holy Scripture, is conferr'd upon him as a Man, Mediator between God and Men; and that neither to Him nor to the Holy Ghost, there ever was any Worship given under any express Names, Appellations or Descriptions, as Persons of God distinct from God the Father. But, supposing them to have been from Eternity such Persons, they were always worshipp'd as implied in God the Father; and consequently the Argument in the Objection, for the Worship of the Holy Spirit expressly, because Christ is worshipp'd expressly, is of no force.

My second Answer to the same Objection is this: I observed above, that other Persons are sometimes joined with God the Father, as Objects of some great Work ascribed, or some Honour given by Men, when yet that Work or Honour respects Almighty God in one manner, and those other Persons in another manner; as in the Israelites believing in the Lord and in *Moses*; the People fearing the Lord and *Samuel*; *Gideon's* Army, *crying, The Sword of the Lord, and of* Gideon. I now add 1 *Chr.* 29. 20. where it is said, *All the Congregation blessed the Lord God of their Fathers, and bowed down their Heads, and worshipped the Lord and the King.* So it is when Christ is worshipped with the Father, as *Rev.* 5. 13. he is differenced (as I shewed) from him that sitteth upon the Throne, by the Appellation of *the Lamb that was slain, and had redeemed us to God by his Blood.* But as for the Holy Ghost, as he is not considered in the Adoration given to him under any other Notion than of God, or a Person of God, so your Liturgy respects him in the same manner, and in coequality with God the Father; not as Christ, who received from the Bounty of his Father, that Power for which he is to be honoured and obeyed. Thus the *eleven Disciples*, after his Resurrection, and at his departure from them, *worshipped him.* Matth. 28. 17. *And Jesus came, and spake unto them,*

saying, All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth: Go ye THEREFORE and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. This Scripture is chiefly urged as a Proof of three equal Almighty and Adorable Persons in God: But the inequality of the Son to the Father is most evident, in that the Son saith immediately before, *That all Power was given to him*; and lays the Authority of this great and extensive Commission of so making Disciples, baptizing them, upon that Donation: which is the more observable, because it is the custom of all Princes, built upon most weighty Reason, that when they send out extraordinary Embassadors, they enforce their Authority with the best and highest of their Titles and Powers: consequently this, of having all Power given to him, was our Lord Jesus's highest Title. And then it's preposterous to imagine, that the Holy Ghost who is mention'd after him, should have a higher Title, to wit, of a personal God: But if he have not that, you will acknowledge that no Adoration is due to him.

And now I know how strong a Prejudice both the Church-men and Dissenters in general have against this Discourse: So strong, that it may be doubted, whether many of them will give it the reading; and of those that will, very few will take any consideration of the Reasons I have alledg'd against this inveterate practice of worshipping expressly the Holy Ghost: And of those few, it will be as hard to find one that will give my Arguments their due weight, as it is to find a Papist that will be convinced of the Absurdities of Transubstantiation, or the Dishonour done to God in worshipping the Virgin *Mary*, and other Saints, and their dead Images. So loth is every one to judg himself to have been in an Error, especially in so great an one as is the religious Worship of a false Object; and more yet, when we have the concurrence of the Multitude of Learned and Unlearned on our side. But those that will be sincere in the Study of Religion, (as all must that shall enter into Life) ought to consider that many Corruptions crept into the Christian Church very early, as every one that is but a little acquainted with Antiquity, knows. And the fourth Council of *Carthage*, which was celebrated about the end of the fourth Century, seems to have judg'd this worshipping of the Holy Ghost an Innovation, when it decreed thus; *Cum ad altare assistitur*, &c. Which may be Englished, *In the Church let Prayer be made to God by only the Name of the Father.* And there are not wanting Learned Authors who tell us, It was several hundreds of Years before the Publick Prayers had in them any Prayer to the Holy Ghost: Of which thing the Commentators on the Offices and Rituals of the Church, give this remarkable Reason, *Quia S. Spiritus, Because the Holy Spirit is the Gift, not the Giver.* And *Bingham* and others observe, that St. *Hilary*, who wrote twelve Books of the *Trinity*, never call'd the Holy Ghost *God*, never said that he was to be worshipped, but only to be obtain'd. And Dr. *Sparke* on the Liturgy acknowledges, that the Doxology so often reiterated in the Common Prayer, did formerly run thus, *Glory be to the Father, through the Son, and by the Holy Ghost. We worship* (says *Origen*, contra Celsum) *the one only God, and his one only Son, and Word and Similitude, with our utmost Supplications and Honours, bringing our Prayers to the God of all things, through his only begotten Son.* Here's no mention of the Holy Ghost.

If *Nadab* and *Abihu* were devoured by Fire from the Lord, for offering strange Fire before him which he commanded them not; who shall not dread to worship even another Almighty Person equal to him, which he has so strictly forbidden? The Times of Ignorance God winks at; but when his Mind is clearly made known, then he commands all Men every where to repent.

I remember that a most eminent and pious *Conformist* Preacher of *London*, (whose Funerals were worthily solemniz'd with Tears and Elegies) about thirty Years ago, did, upon the

the account of the Reflection upon the Holy Scriptures, and the Scandal given to some of his Hearers, by that Doxology I have been speaking of, did, I say, forbear to use it as long as he lived. A rare Example! But how contrary is the Spirit that now reigns among our Clergy, who make use of this Doxology as the very Mark of Orthodoxy; and will at no time forbear it, especially if they find any Person in the Congregation that is offended with it.

You ought to remember, the Popish Errors had prevail'd long, when the Reformers began; yes, some of them longer than your Adoration of the Holy Ghost: And it was esteem'd as horrid an Heresy to deny the Adoration of the Host, as of the Holy Ghost; and those that reform'd in that Point, were as few in Number as we that reform in this. Why should you think you have reform'd all the Errors of so corrupt a Church, or that her Antichristianism consists only in those things that you have reform'd? Remember, that the most High God proclaims himself jealous in no Commandments but those of his Worship; and try again whether you give him no cause to be so: See if you can satisfy your Consciences in those Adorations; be so kind and Christian, as to inform us how we may satisfy ours. If you cannot satisfy us who are ready to receive Satisfaction, then you ought to allow our Dissent and Separation from your Worship. In the mean time it will be our Duty to profess our Thankfulness to God through Christ, who has bestowed so great a Benefit upon us, as to deliver us from so great an Error, whereby we were confounded in the Worship of God, and in reading and understanding of the Holy Scriptures. O thou God and Father, strengthen us to walk worthy of so great a Blessing!

POSTSCRIPT.

HAving spoken of the Unlawfulness, and consequently the Danger of worshipping the Holy Ghost expressly, it may not be unseasonable to repeat that important Query, *viz.*

Whether the Faith and Worship of Three Almighty and only Wise Persons, or of one only, to wit, The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, be most dangerous to the Souls of Men?

The Trinitarians and Unitarians agree, that there is but one God most High: they both agree that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is that most High God. They differ in this, that Jesus before he was a Man, and from Eternity, and also the Holy Ghost, as distinct Persons from God the Father, were and are each of them as perfectly God most High, as the Father; so that each of them is Almighty, Eternal, All-knowing, only Wise, only Good, Infinite, *&c.* equal to the Father. The Trinitarians assert these things, the Unitarians deny them.

The Question hereupon is, Which of these Parties are in the most dangerous Error, supposing them to be in Error, now the one, now the other?

If the Trinitarians err, they worship two Persons in God equal to one who is undoubtedly God; that is, they worship three Almighty and only Wise Persons, which are not distinguishable (especially in Worship) from three most High Gods.

If the Unitarians err, they avoid that Error of worshipping three Persons, which they cannot distinguish from three Gods; but their Error lies in holding so strictly to the Oneness of God, as well in Person as Essence, that they do not acknowledg besides

sides that One, two more Persons to be equally God, as well as that One. Both both Parties agree to be so: that is, they err in not worshipping two unnecessary Persons in God, but holding that the God and Father of Christ is God alone, only Necessary and All-sufficient.

If the Trinitarians err, they err against the common Reason of Mankind, and most plain and express Scriptures, which assert that God is One, or that there is but one most High God, or God of Gods, and throughout speak of him as of one only Person. If the Unitarians err, they err against the doubtful Sense of some obscure Texts, which are either variously read in the Hebrew and Greek, or not rightly translated, or which fairly admit of another Interpretation consistent with the Unity of the Person of God.

In short, the Question is, Whether the Term God includes only one Person, or three Persons? One Almighty Person, or three distinct Almighty Persons? And whether the former or the latter is the more dangerous Error, which soever is found an Error?

Mat. 23. 24. *Ye blind Guides, which strain at a Gnat, and swallow a Camel.*
John 9. 40. *And some of the Pharisees* ——— *said unto him, Are we blind also?*

THE END.

THE Unreasonableness OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY Briefly Demonstrated, In a LETTER to a FRIEND.

Faciunt ne intelligendo, ut nihil intelligant.

London, Printed in the Year, 1692.

The Unreasonableness of the Doctrine of the Trinity briefly demonstrated.

SIR.

I Am very sorry your Affairs don't allow you to come again into these Parts, to continue the Conferences which we began some Months ago. You know that we run over many Sects of Christianity, with no other design but of instructing our selves, and that after a sincere and unprejudiced Examination of most Opinions, which divide Christians now a-days: we were satisfied that a great many Disputes, of which they are so proud, run only either upon equivocal, confused or unintelligible Terms. We had not time enough to examine the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; and tho then you seem'd to be perfectly convinced of the Truth thereof, yet I see by your obliging Letter, that you begin to doubt of a Doctrine, which heretofore you called the Foundation of the Christian Religion, and its distinguishing Character from all other Religions. I ascribe this Change to your Sincerity; and knowing you approve the Maxim of the Poet,

Cur nescire, pudens prave, quam discere malo?

I am not surprized to see you examine a Matter which heretofore you thought undeniable. I add, that the Reflections you have made since we parted, upon the clear and evident Principles which we laid down in our Conferences, and the necessary Consequences which spring from them, have not a little contributed to your Doubts about the Doctrine of the Trinity. There was no need of so many Intreaties, to oblige me to write to you on this Subject. You know I never make any difficulty of imparting to my Friends my Thoughts about Matters of Religion; and I should already have answered your Letter, had not a Journey of ten days hindred me. I shall endeavour at present not only to confirm you in your Doubts, but also prove by solid Arguments, and clear and undeniable Principles, that *the Doctrine of the Trinity is the most unreasonable Opinion in the World.*

The *Trinitarians* and the *Unitarians* agree in this, *viz.* That there is but One God: but they differ in another respect; for the latter acknowledg none to be the Supreme God, but Him who is called in the Gospel *the Father of Jesus Christ*; whereas the other pretend that *Jesus Christ*, or the Son, and the *Holy Ghost* together with the Father, are that one Supreme God. This the Trinitarians call *Three Persons, and One God.* Therefore this is the true State of the Question, *viz. Whether God is the Father only*; or, *Whether he is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*; that is to say, as those Gentlemen are pleased to talk, *Three Divine Persons?*

I don't intend to prove by the Scripture that there are not *Three Persons* in God, for I think it altogether needless. I have often wondered to see the Unitarians heap up Arguments to prove that the Scripture teaches not three Divine Persons in God. Methinks

this way of confuting their Adversaries supposes that they understand their Terms, or at least that their Notion of this Proposition, *There are Three Persons in God*, is clear enough. In effect here they begin the Assault. They no sooner hear this Proposition, but they use all Endeavours to shew its Contradiction. One would think that they have a true Notion of the Terms of Three Persons in One God, and that it remains only to prove, that altho the Terms are intelligible, yet the thing it self is contradictory. But it is quite the contrary. I dare say that both Parties dispute in vain, the one in maintaining that there are Three Person in One God, and the other in maintaining the contrary. The Reason is, that neither the one nor the other have any Idea of the word *Person* in God. This word, so famous amongst Christians, is like that of *Fortune*, which the Pagans so much talk'd of, without fixing any Idea to it. This being supposed, it is plain that there is no need to run, I shall not only say, to the Scripture, but also to Reason, to refute a Doctrine altogether unintelligible; a Doctrine, of which the Terms made use of to express it, excite no Idea in the Mind of the Hearer, no more than the Names of Colours in the Mind of a Man born blind.

I shall now endeavour to prove what I have hitherto supposed, *viz.* That the Term of *Divine Person* made use of by the Trinitarians, is *a vain Sound, which produces no Idea.* But, before I lay down the Reasons, whereupon my Opinion is grounded, I desire you to observe, that when I say there is no need to have recourse to the Scripture to confute the Trinitarians, I do not mean that it can never be used against them. It may certainly be alledged, to prove that neither the Son nor Holy Spirit are the most High God, because the Scripture expressly teaches us, that the Father only is the most High God. But I think it nedless to cite the Scripture against the Doctrine of three Persons in God.

You know, Sir, that Men have invented Languages only to communicate their Thoughts one to another, and to be thereby in a condition of holding a mutual Correspondence. In effect, without the use of some articulated Sounds, to which certain Notions have been fixed by a general Consent, and which are made use of to excite in the Hearer's Mind the same Ideas that are in the Mind of the Speaker; without such a use, I say, Men would not be very useful one to another; and the Advantages of such a Society, if it may be so called, would be very inconsiderable, and contribute but little to its Preservation. Languages may therefore be called the Bonds of Society; they are as it were the Conduits whereby we impart to others our most secret Thoughts. God, who was pleased to create Men, that they might live in Society, hath also ordered they should use such means to attain to their end.

From what I have said, these two Consequences do evidently arise. The first is, That Men ought to use no words that can excite no Idea. To speak an unknown Language, is to put an Affront upon Mankind, it is to break the Bonds of Society, oppose God's Design, and introduce a Confusion more dangerous than that of *Babel*. The second Consequence is, that whosoever invents new Words, or fixes new Ideas to those that are already used, is bound to acquaint with it the Society he lives in, and exactly to determine the signification of such words, that no body may be mistaken, and all the Inconveniences I have been speaking of may be avoided.

What I have said may be easily applied to the Trinitarians. They do manifestly go against the two Rules I have laid down. For, 1. They have invented new Terms which produce no Idea, when they maintain that there are three Persons in God. I call those Terms *new*, because, besides that they are not to be found in the Scripture, they do not signify in the Trinitarian Hypothesis, what the word *Person* doth commonly signify, *viz. an Intelligent Being*. When they

they affirm that there are three Persons in God, they do not mean that there are *three Intelligent Beings* in God; for it is a meer *Polytheism*. 'Tis true Dr. *Sherlock* explains the three Persons of the Divinity in this last sense; but this is only the bold Opinion of a private Man, who hath no Followers in the Society; and we should wrong the Trinitarians in general, should we affirm that they believe a God made up of three distinct Intelligent Beings. I am therefore in the right, when I say that those Terms are new, since they lose their natural Signification when applied to the Divinity. 2. But this is not all, they are *unintelligible* besides. I maintain the Trinitarians have no Idea of them, and whatsoever noise they make of three Persons in God, they know not what they mean. This will clearly appear by the following Reflection.

The Trinitarians could never tell us what they mean by those three Persons. This is so true, that Dr. *Wallis*, a famous Divine, and a great Mathematician, from whom we had reason to expect some extraordinary Discovery about the sense of those Terms, having undertaken to satisfy the Unitarians upon this Subject, even *Geometrically*, was contented to let them know that the three Persons of the Divinity are *Three* SOMEWHATS, that is, in plain English, *Three I know not whats*. It may be said, without wronging the Doctor, that after such great Pains and Labour, after so many and so particularized Comparisons between the *three Dimensions of a Cube*, and the three Persons of the Divinity, his Demonstration is a meer *Chimera*. But what, says the Doctor, can any Parallel be more exact than this? Since we see a *Cube*, which hath three Dimensions, *viz. Length, Breadth and Depth*, distinguish'd one from another; *one* Cube, which is at the same time *long, broad* and *deep*, why can't we conceive *three somewhats* in God, whereof the one is called the *Father*, the second the *Son*, and the third the *Holy Ghost?* Is there any Contradiction in it? I confess I see none; for a Contradiction can never be discovered but between *two Ideas*. Indeed I have the Idea of a Cube and its Dimensions, but having no Idea of the three *somewhats* in question, I cannot judg whether the Parallel is right or not. If any body should tell me that two is equal to four, I could presently find out a Contradiction, because having an Idea of two and an Idea of four, I do demonstratively see that two is but the half of four; I do presently perceive the Relation which is between those two Ideas. But if any Man should tell me that two is equal to a *somewhat*, having no Idea of that *somewhat*, I cannot judg whether they are equal or not. This, Sir, you may apply to the matter in hand. It follows therefore, that all those Comparisons are altogether useless, not to say ridiculous, unless we are plainly told what we must understand by the three Divine Persons.

The Doctor thought that by the help of his Parallel, he could free the Doctrine of the Trinity from the pressing Objections of the Unitarians: but they pretend on the contrary, that he hath greatly injured the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, by calling them three *somewhats*, as if this was all that we can know of them. Thus they argue. Our Hypothesis is undoubtedly the most rational, for it teaches us that there is one only God, called in the Gospel the Father of Jesus Christ: We know therefore what that Father is, since he is that only God of whom we have an Idea. But if we must believe the Trinitarians, we cannot pretend to so great a Knowledg; no, we cannot know that Father, for he is but *a somewhat*, of which we have no Idea. 2. We profess to know that Jesus Christ is the Son of God after a miraculous and extraordinary manner, because he was conceived in the Womb of a Virgin by the Operation of the Holy Ghost; because the Father hath sanctified and sent him into the World; because the same Father hath raised him from the Dead to a glorious Immortality: Lastly, because he hath made him Heir of all things, given him all Power in Heaven and on Earth,

Earth, crowned him with Glory and Honour, made him sit at his Right-hand, and exalted him to a glorious Kingdom. These are the Grounds and the Foundations of his Sonship clearly laid down in the Scripture. All those Ideas of the Greatness and Dignity of Christ seem to us clear, great and magnificent. But the Trinitarians do almost annihilate the reality of those Ideas, by representing that Son of God as a meer *somewhat*. We are too well instructed in the Nature and Dignity of the Son of God, to speak of him in such Terms as do him but little Honour. At least after the Evangelical Description which we have made of him; it would be but a small addition of Glory to him to add that he is *a somewhat* besides. Lastly, We believe, say they, as the Scripture teaches us, that the Holy Ghost is the Virtue and Power of God, whereby he created the World, governs it, and worketh all sorts of Miracles. But alas! if we believe the Trinitarians, we must not pretend to so high a degree of Knowledg, and we must be contented with a *somewhat*.

Thus, Sir, you see how the Trinitarians ridicule the Object of our Worship. For since God is, in their Opinion, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that is to say, three Persons, it is plain our Knowledg of him must be proportionable to the Knowledg we have of the three Persons. But if the most perfect Knowledg we can have of them consists only in knowing that they are three *somewhats*, it doth evidently follow, that God with respect to us is but a *somewhat*, and that this is all we can know of him. Don't think that this is only the Opinion of Dr. *Wallis*, no, it is the general Opinion of our Divines, as it appears by the great Applauses and Encomiums they have bestowed upon Dr. *Wallis*'s Writings. I praise them for their Sincerity; for since their Knowledg of the three Persons of the Divinity doth not reach farther than the Doctor's, 'tis well done ingenuously to confess that they know no more of them than he. But methinks they should at the same time sincerely own that they know nothing, and talk of what they do not understand. The *Cartesians* have laught at *Aristotle*, because when he pretended to explain the Causes of the *Phenomena's* of Nature, he gravely said, that they were *Occult Qualities*. It would have been better, sincerely to confess his Ignorance, than to return an Answer no more satisfying, than if he had said, *I know not*. The Trinitarians follow the method of that Philosopher. We ask them, what they mean by three Persons in God? They answer, they are three *somewhats*. Were it not better for them to confess that they know not what they are, since their Answer is an undeniable mark of their Ignorance? Suppose an *Indian* having no Idea of God, should ask a Christian, what he means by the word *God*, and he should be answered that he is *three Somewhats*: it cannot be denied that after such an Answer, he would not be a whit more advanced in the Knowledg of God than he was before. Why do therefore the Trinitarians require of us that we should rest satisfied with an Answer that teaches us nothing? We will always with Reason object to them, that they have without Reason undertaken the Defence of a Doctrine of which they have no Idea; and we challenge them in due form, to give us any other Definition of the word *Person* in God, but that of a *somewhat*, or something near a-kin to it.

Certainly the Trinitarians of this Nation, which is accounted the purest and most enlightned in matters of Religion, are very unfortunate. Was there ever any thing more opposed than the two famous Combatants who have entred into the Lists against the Unitarians, I mean Dr. *Sherlock* and Dr. *Wallis*? The one pretends that three Persons in God signify three Intelligent Beings. No, says the other, this comes too near Polytheism: Three Persons in God do properly signify three *somewhats*. Strange! What then? Is there no Medium between three Intelligent Beings and three *Somewhats*? Shall we not see a third Doctor, who by opposing on one hand Dr. *Sherlock*'s *Tritheism*,

Sotism, may let Dr. *Wallis* know that he might have said something more positive and satisfying about the three Persons of the Trinity? No, 'tis in vain that we hope to see a third Combatant. Our Divines have exhausted the Subject, they do all resolve to stick to Dr. *Wallis's* Decision, and are conscious to themselves, that whatever Endeavours they use, they can bring forth nothing but three *Somewhats*.

Perhaps, Sir, I have insisted too long upon the three *Somewhats*. But it was necessary to pursue our Opposers into this their last Retrenchments, and shew them how strangely they impose upon themselves. I will not leave them here, I will examine their other Shifts, and follow them step by step in the method they make use of to justify their manner of explaining the three Persons of the Trinity. Hitherto I have not alledged the Scripture, because I thought it not necessary, as I have already said. But now that I have got off the three *Somewhats*, I come to the Scripture, and shall make as much use of it, as the Brevity of a Letter will allow me. My first design, when I took Pen in hand to write to you, was to prove that the Doctrine of the Trinity, or three Persons in one God, is altogether unintelligible; that the Trinitarians have no Idea of it no more than we, and talk of it as blind Men of Colours. This, I think, is the right method to put an end to our Disputes, and shew the folly of them. But to return.

First, In the first place therefore, the Trinitarians say, that the Doctrine of the Trinity is a great Mystery, and by Consequence 'tis no wonder if their Explications and Definitions are not as clear and positive as one could wish for, since it is the Nature of a Mystery to be wrapp'd up in Darkness, and that very Obscurity distinguishes it from things that are no Mysteries. I confess the Doctrine of three Persons in God, is a great Mystery, since it cannot be explained but by three *Somewhats*. Mysteries, as long as they are so, and remain unrevealed, are things perfectly unknown, and of which we have no Notion: now why we should talk so much of Mysteries is a great Mystery to me. But how come those Gentlemen to know that this Doctrine is a Mystery? To speak thus, the Scripture should expressly tell them, that altho there is but one God, yet there are in that God three Persons; and that it is an unspeakable Mystery, a Mystery that ought to be adored with a profound Humility, and cannot be explained. But where doth the Scripture say so? On the contrary, as often as it mentions a Mystery, it formally teaches us what Doctrines are contained in it, it explains them clearly and positively, and acquaints us that those Doctrines are called Mysteries, not because they are unintelligible, but because before the Dispensation of the Gospel, they were unknown and lay in Obscurity; *But now*, say the holy Apostles, *God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit*. It is therefore certain that this Mystery is of the Trinitarians coining, and no where to be found in the Scripture.

Secondly, It is true, say they, that the Scripture doth not in express Terms teach the Doctrine which we maintain, and call it a Mystery, yet it is grounded upon natural and undeniable Consequences. The Revelation, as they go on, teaches us that there is but one God; but at the same time it gives the Name and Attributes of the Divinity, not only to the Father, but also to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. From whence they conclude, that the Son and the Holy Ghost, together with the Father, are that one God. This, say they, we call a great Mystery, and express by three Persons, and one God. But this being an impenetrable Secret which God hath not thought fit to unfold to us, the clearest and most accurate Notion we can have of those three Persons is, that they are three *Somewhats*. This is the great Argument of the Trinitarians. For my part, I look upon it as a bold Sophism, and it is not a difficult thing to shew the Weakness and Fallacy thereof.

1. First, they are so bold as to affirm that the Holy Ghost is called *God* in the holy Scrip-

Scripture. This is so palpably false, that the most learned Criticks amongst the Protestants have ingenuously confest that this was a mistake. That place of the Acts of the Apostles, the most specious they can alledg, doth not positively say, that the Holy Ghost is God; nor do they pretend to prove it, but by a pitiful Consequence. To insist any longer upon this would be time lost: I am sure any sincere and unprejudiced Reader will grant what I say. But if the Holy Ghost is *the Power of God*, as the Scripture saith, and it hath been proved in several late Tracts: If, I say, the Holy Ghost is the Power of God, is it a great wonder that God's Works should be ascribed to *it*? Nothing can be more natural.

2. It hath often been proved by undeniable Arguments, that the Trinitarians cannot shew that Christ is called God in most places of the Scripture that are alledged to that purpose. The most learned Protestant Criticks explain them otherways. In a word, those Gentlemen have often been challenged, and are so still, to prove that the Unitarian Sense cannot be put upon them without wresting the Text. The beginning of St. *John*'s Gospel is one of the places excepted by me, wherein Christ, some say, is called God. But this is so dark and difficult a Text, that I frankly confess, I do not well understand it. Altho the Arian and Socinian Explications of it are neither unintelligible nor ridiculous, yet I am not satisfied with them: but least of all with the Trinitarian Sense. There is so much Nonsense in it, that it would be enough to make one an Unitarian, to see the strongest place the Trinitarians have for their Cause, so hardly used and strangely stuffed with Galey-mafrey. If those Gentlemen would or could give us a *Rational* Paraphrase of that famous Text, they would do us an infinite Kindness. I refer you to Dr. *Shirlock*'s Paraphrase paraphrased in the *Defence of the brief History of the Unitarians*, p. 41. However, will they say Christ is called God in this place? This is no wonder to me, when I consider that *Solomon* is twice honoured with the same Title in the 45*th* Psalm, which is evidently an *Epithalamium*, or Nuptial Song, on his Marriage with the Daughter of the King of *Egypt*. It is therefore no surprising thing, that he who is *greater* than *Solomon*, the Messias, to whom all Power is given in Heaven and on Earth, and whom God hath exalted above Men and Angels, should be so called. Much less shall we wonder at it, if we consider that in the Scripture, Judges and Magistrates are represented to us under the same Name, because of the Power and Authority they are invested with. It is for the same Reason, and in the same Sense, that the sacred Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, (*Chap.* 1. 8, 9.) applies to Christ the same place of the 45*th* Psalm, wherein *Solomon* is called God. This place and the beginning of St. *John*'s Gospel are, in my Judgment, the two only Texts wherein that Title is bestowed upon Christ. I don't see what the Trinitarians can get by them, since they cannot explain the latter intelligibly; and the other being applied to Christ, tho in a more sublime Sense, since he is far above *Solomon*, yet doth not prove that he is the most High God no more than *Solomon*. As for the Divine Attributes, so much talked of by the Trinitarians, which they say the Scripture ascribes to Christ: I think it is enough to confute them, that they should be told they have much encreased those Attributes, as Criticks have proved; and that abating whatever the Trinitarians have added of their meer Liberality, the Scriptures will be found to contain nothing but what may be said of the King, whom God hath crowned with Glory and Honour, exalted above Men and Angels, and invested with all Power in Heaven and on Earth: Whatever the Scripture says of him, tho never so great and glorious, is suitable to him in that respect, and it cannot be inferred from thence, that he is the most High God.

3. But let us suppose that the Unitarians are mistaken in their Explication of the controverted places, (pray, Sir, remember this

this is but a Supposition) and that the Scripture gives the Name and Attributes of God to Christ and the Holy Ghost. This being supposed, let's see whether the Consequence they draw from thence is *natural* and *reasonable*, whether the Doctrine they build upon that Consequence implies no *Contradiction*, or at least whether it is *intelligible*.

1st. It is an amazing thing that the Holy Ghost hath not revealed to us *in express Terms* so important and necessary a Doctrine, and which those Gentlemen call the Foundation of the Christian Religion; or at least, that neither Christ nor his Apostles have drawn the Trinitarian Consequence. Is it not a great Prejudice against that Doctrine, and is not one apt to believe for that very reason, that the Doctrine of the Trinity is a meer human Invention? In effect, is it likely that God, who was pleased to reveal to us so many things of no great importance, if compared to this Doctrine; that God, I say, who hath taught us in his Word so many Particulars, would have omitted the most Essential Part, and not expressly taught us the Doctrine of the Trinity? Must so important a Mystery, on which the great Doctrines of the *Incarnation* and *Satisfaction* depend, and the whole Dispensation of the Gospel runs, and which sets forth God's Mercy and Justice with a Lustre infinitely greater than the poor and beggarly System of Heretics; must, I say, so great and so glorious a Subject be so expressly as to lie unknown without the help of human Consequences? Shall the Gospel teach us that Christ went into *Jerusalem* riding upon an Ass, and not teach us in express words that he is *consubstantial* with the Father, and the *most High God?* What can one say to justify so surprizing a Conduct? Is it becoming God's Wisdom that the Knowledg of so great a Subject, and impenetrable to Reason, should depend upon a certain Consequence, which Men subject to Error ought to draw? What Reason can be alledged to prove that God, who hath revealed to us so many things of an infinitely lesser moment, ought not clearly and expressly to acquaint us with the Doctrine of the Trinity, but give up so great a Discovery to the weak Capacity of Men? Certainly this is to wrong the Divine Wisdom and Goodness. Sir, you must confess that this Reflection alone is sufficient to destroy the Pretences of our *Consequence-Drawers*, and convince any sincere and rational Man of the Falsity of this Doctrine.

2dly. This Consequence is so unreasonable, and contrary to the Gospel, that one cannot but wonder how it ever came into a Man's Mind. Methinks a sincere and unprejudiced Christian should reason thus when he reads the Gospel. "The Scripture ought "to be explained by it self. 'Tis true, "Christ is called God therein; but can I "infer from thence that he is the most High "God? Christ himself, who is honoured "with that Title, teaches me that Life Eter-"nal consists in knowing the Father the *only* "true God; and his Apostle assures us that "we have but *one* God, even the *Father*: the "Scripture teaches us the same in many o-"ther places of the Gospel. Moreover, "Christ calls the Father *his God*, and often "prays to him: He says that the Father is "*greater* than he, that he can do nothing of "himself, but that the Father who dwelleth "in him doth the Works. He assures us "that he doth not know the Day of Judg-"ment, &c. I find the same clearly expresst "and often repeated in the Holy Scripture. "The Question therefore is, Whether I "must believe that Christ is the most High "God, because he is called *God* in the Gospel, "tho the same Gospel assures me that the "Father only is the most High God? The "Question is, Whether, for the same rea-"son, I must acknowledg Christ to be the "most High God, tho he himself assures me "that the Father is his God, and is invoked "by him as such; tho he expresly tells me "that the Father is greater than he, that he "can do nothing of himself, that all his "Miracles are the Effects of his Father's "Power; tho he assures me that he is "ignorant

" ignorant of the Day of Judgment, and " that the Knowledg of that Secret belongs " only to the Father, the most High God? &c. " After so clear and so positive a Confession, " I cannot believe that Christ is the most " High God, and draw the Trinitarians Con- " sequence, without belying the Son of God, " who assures me that the Father only is " the most High God. Must I prefer a hu- " man Consequence before the Oracles of " Christ? In a word, Doth it stand to rea- " son, that I should believe the Trinitarians " sooner than the Son of God?

You see, Sir, that this is a close and natural Reasoning. The Christian who argues thus, contrives no new Words, and draws no Consequences unknown to the Scripture: He follows the Gospel step by step, and speaks its very Language. Christ tells him that the Father only is God, he believes him upon his word, and will by no means contradict him. In effect, if the Father only is the most High God, it is impossible Christ should be the most High God; and by Consequence, if he is called God, it must of necessity be in the same sense as *Solomon*, and the Judges and Magistrates are honoured with that Title, because they represent his Person, act in his Name, and are invested with his Power and Authority. The Consequence of our Christian is not far fetch'd, dark, unnatural, and doth not contradict the Gospel: No, it is clear, easy, natural, and perfectly agreeable to the Genius of the Scripture, and all the parts of the Gospel. Nay, it is none of his, Christ himself drew it before him, and he doth but follow his steps. Read the 10th Chapter of St. *John's* Gospel. The Jews out of Spite and Malice accuse him of *making* himself *God*. How doth our Saviour justify himself? Doth he tell them that he is God? No: *Is it not written*, says he, *in your Law, I said ye are Gods? If he called them Gods, unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?* Here Christ plainly denies that he is the most High God, only he intimates, that since Judges and Magistrates may be stiled *Gods*, upon the account of the Power and Authority they have received from God, much more might he be so called because of his glorious Consecration, as having received immediately from God a Commission and an Authority far exceeding any other. Is there any Trinitarian that can alledg a Consequence drawn by Christ himself to maintain his Opinion? No, this is the Privilege of the Unitarians; and the Defenders of the Trinity have no other Consequences but such as they coin, without the least appearance of Reason, and against the whole Current of the Bible. What I have said of Christ, may be as easily applied to the Holy Ghost. I leave the Application to you.

Now, Sir, give me leave to introduce a Trinitarian Reasoning according to his Principles, and drawing his Consequence. " 'Tis true, says he, that the Scripture " teaches us that the Father only is God. " I cannot deny but Christ expresses himself " so as to make us believe that he is not the " most High God. It is certain the Gospel " is full of such Texts; But at the same " time I observe that Christ is called God " in the Scripture. Indeed the Holy Ghost " is not expressly called God, but I can " shew by the help of my Consequences, " that he is so called. This being supposed, " I argue thus. The Scripture assures us " that there is but one God, but that Title " is ascribed not only to the Father, but " also to the Son and Holy Ghost. From " whence I conclude by a natural Conse- " quence, that the Father, Son, and Holy " Ghost are that One God. 'Tis true, they " object to me, that Christ calls the Father " the only True God; and St. *Paul* ex- " pressly says, that to us there is but One " God the Father. I confess this is a great " Objection; however, it may be answered, " that the Father signifies in those places " not only the Father, but also the Son and " the Holy Ghost. I cannot maintain the " second

" second Consequence I have just now set " down, but by a third which necessarily " arises from it. As for those Texts where" in Christ tells us that the Father is greater " than he, that he can do nothing of him" self, that the Father is his God, that he " is ignorant of the Day of Judgment, and " such like Texts, which seem to prove " that he is not the most High God: One " may answer them with a fourth Conse" quence, which affords this Distinction, *viz.* " That the Father is greater than he, *&c.* " *as he is a Man*, but *as he is God* he is e" qual to the Father, can do all things " of himself, *&c.* It is much more rea" sonable to draw all those Consequences, " tho never so strained, than to explain " the Title of God given to Christ in the " Scripture, in the sense of the Hereticks.

Indeed, Sir, this System, made up of Consequences, is diverting enough. The Scripture it seems affords no positive Arguments in the behalf of the Doctrine of the Trinity. It runs altogether upon chimerical, absurd and contradictory Consequences. This System I said is pleasant enough, but I must confess I am extreamly sorry to see the Gospel so strangely ridiculed by its Professors. Is it not to scorn the Scripture, to heap up Consequences to find in it what it doth not say? Why do those Gentlemen complain that the Papists make *a Nose of Wax* of it? Are their Consequences more unnatural than those which they themselves draw? 'Tis true, the Papists are grosly mistaken in believing that the Bread of the Eucharist is converted into the Body of Christ after the Consecration. Their Error arises from sticking too close to the Letter of Christ's words, who said, *This is my Body.* Christ said so, will they say; and we believe him. But if I dare say so, the Protestants, who are Trinitarians as well as they, do not shew so much Respect for his Oracles in this Case Christ says in express words, that the Father is the only true God. No, say they, the Father is not the only true God; the Son and the Holy Ghost must be added to him.

3*dly.* Having thus confuted the great Consequence of the Trinitarians, I will now consider the Doctrine of the Trinity in it self, and see whether it implies no Contradiction. The Father, say they, is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God. Now I ask them what Notion we have of God? They will undoubtedly answer, that God is a Being Eternal, Intelligent, All-wise, All-good, All-powerful, *&c.* This being supposed, since the Father is God, he must needs be a Being Eternal, Intelligent, *&c.* Thus much must be said of the Son, and Holy Ghost: Here are therefore three Beings Eternal, Intelligent, *&c.* For since the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are not confounded, but distinguished, and every one of them is God; the Notion which we have of God must needs suite every one of them distinctly, and consequently, they are three Beings Eternal, Intelligent, *&c.* that is to say, three Gods. But the Trinitarians will not allow this Polytheism: No, say they, we maintain the contrary. 'Tis true, the Father is a Being Eternal, *&c.* so is the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Yet they are not Three, but One Being Eternal, *&c.* In a word, we acknowledg that the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, yet they are not Three Gods, but One God. Sir, when the Trinitarians can shew me that the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, which believes that three Bodies of Christ, which are upon three different Altars, are but one Body of Christ; when, I say, they can shew me that this Opinion is not Parallel with theirs, or implies no Contradiction, I shall willingly confess that the Doctrine of the Trinity is not contradictory. In the mean time, I must tell you, that 'tis pity the Trinitarians should wrest the Scripture, and leave no Stone unturned to produce at last a Doctrine full of Contradictions. Their last Shift and Retrenchment to avoid the Objection concerning the Contradictions, consists in this, *viz.* that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are not Three Gods, but Three Persons and One God.

4*thly.*

Lady. Here is, Sir, the most wonderful *Metamorphosis* that ever you heard of. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are now turned into three Persons, that is to say, three *Somewhats*. I never saw a more irregular and inconstant Method than the Trinitarian; they are perfect *Proteus's*, that turn themselves into all shapes: Sometimes they they give us three Gods, sometimes one; but that which is most afflicting, at last they reduce it to three I know not what, which I look upon as a kind of *Annihilation* of the Supream Being. We humbly desire those Gentlemen to tell us what we are to believe concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity. Must we believe that the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, and yet that there is but one God? We answer, this Doctrine contains on the one hand a horrible Polytheism, and on the other hand, gross Contradictions. Must we believe they are three *Somewhats*? We say that we are not Children to be imposed upon with insignificant words, of which we have no Idea. We will hear a third Catechism when they shall think it fit.

I think, Sir, what I have said is sufficient to make good what I have asserted in the beginning of my Letter, that *the Doctrine of the Trinity is the most unreasonable in the World.* It is a Castle built in the Air, prop'd with Chimerical Consequences and unintelligible words. The Trinitarians may be compared to a company of blind Men, who would talk in earnest of Colours, and give ill words to some other blind Men, who should affirm they have no Idea of the Colours so much talked of by them. I conclude, with putting you in mind again, that the Doctrine of the Trinity hath no positive Arguments in the Scriptures. It runs altogether upon Consequences, which cannot be admitted without ridiculing the Scripture, and belying its Oracles. Go a step further, and then you meet with a dreadful Tritheism, and a heap of frighting Contradictions. And all of a sudden you neither see Contradictions, Polytheism, or God; all vanishes away into *Somewhats*. Certainly so many Windings and Labyrinths are not the Characters of Truth, which is clear, simple and natural. I exhort you to embrace it, and firmly to believe what the Son of God hath taught us in as plain words as can be spoken, that *This is Life Eternal, to know the Father the only true God, and him whom he hath sent, Jesus Christ.* I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

F I N I S.

The Belief of the ATHANASIAN CREED *not required by the Church of* England *as necessary to Salvation.*

In a Letter to a Friend.

My worthy and dear Friend;

SIR, You cannot but remember, that when I was lately in your good Company, there was a Discourse concerning the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as delivered in the Creed call'd *Athanasius*'s; and that there was a Person present who declared his Opinion to be, that the Church of *England* did not require the Belief of that Doctrine as necessary to eternal Salvation, and the Reasons he gives for that his Opinion are briefly these, *viz.*

1. Because (saith he) no Persons are by the Church of *England* (nor I verily think by any Church) ever baptized into the Faith, as contained in that Creed, but in the Apostles Creed.

2. As Persons are admitted by the Church of *England* into her Communion without the Belief of that Creed, so in her Office of the Visitation of the Sick they are not examined in it, but upon a Declaration of stedfast Faith in all the Articles of the Apostles Creed (in which I could never yet find any thing of an *Athanasian* Trinity) Absolution is granted; and in the Office for Burial that Person is owned to be a Christian Brother: and in the last Clause of the Exhortation, immediately preceding the Apostles Creed, in that Office of Visitation 'tis plain, that he that believes the Articles of the Apostles Creed, doth believe as a Christian Man should. And,

3. Because in the Exhortation, almost at the End of Office of Publick Baptism, he that hath declared his Belief of the Articles of the Apostles Creed, is said to believe in God; and in the same Exhortation the Child (as to

Faith) is chiefly to be taught the Creed, which I presume was never understood of the *Athanasian* Creed.

4. Look upon the third Answer in the Church-Catechism, where the Child is taught to answer, that his Godfathers and Godmothers did promise that he should believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith, which Articles the Child being required to rehearse, *Quest.* 5. is directed, and says the Apostles Creed; and it is also evident by the Office of Baptism, no other can be understood in the Baptismal Vow.

5. In the Office of Confirmation, the first Question and Answer, the Person to be confirmed doth declare in the Presence of God and the Congregation, that he doth renew the solemn Promise and Vow that was made in his Name at Baptism, which was to believe the Articles of the Apostles Creed; and neither the Church of *England*, nor yet any other ever dared yet to impose the *Athanasian* Creed as a Condition of Baptism, no more than *Pius* IV. and his Council of *Trent*, dared to impose their novel Faith as a Condition of the same, but content themselves (as we do) with that which bears the Name of the Apostles, as containing the Abstract of all Primitive Christianity. See Dr. *Ford*'s Sermon before the Lord-Mayor, *June* 5. 1692. p. 18. And by such Practice 'tis apparent, as the Doctor there clearly argues, that whatsoever Men may talk, yet they do not believe those Articles to be *de fide*, and necessary to Salvation, without the Profession of which they admit by Baptism Proselytes into the Church; and consequently that Men cannot exclude those from their Church, for not believing those Articles that they dare not impose, no nor mention to those they admit to be Members of their Church.

But I find 'tis commonly objected, that the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as delivered in the *Athanasian* Creed, is contained in the 39 Articles; and that every Clergy-man that holds any Place of Profit in the Church, is bound to subscribe them, and give his unfeigned Assent and Consent to the same. To which may be answered;

1*st*. That those 39 Articles are not Articles of Faith but Peace, as several of her most learned Bishops have plainly declared. See Archbish. *Bramhall*'s *Schism guarded*, p. 396. Which Passage is both cited and approved by the excellent Bishop *Fowler*, in his *Free Discourse*. And the Bishops *Laud*, *Taylor*, *Sanderson*, have expressed themselves to the same purpose. And in a word, the Title of the Articles says as much.

2dly. Because, if the 39 Articles were Articles of Faith, the Church would baptize into them.

3dly. If the 39 Articles became Articles of Faith by subscribing them, then it would follow that the Clergy would have more Articles of Faith than the Laiety, and then further there would be more than one Faith, which is contrary to the express Words of Holy Scripture.

4thly. Because in the sixth Article the Church declares that all things necessary to Salvation are contained in the Holy Scriptures; and thereto nothing is to be added, nor from it any thing to be diminished; the Canonical Books of the Holy Scripture are in that *6th* Article named, & thereby the 39 Articles are excluded, otherwise than agreeable with them. But I find it's further objected,

Object. That the *8th* Article requires that the *Nicene*, *Athanasian* and Apostles Creeds be thorowly received and believed; and hence it seems evident, that the Church imposes the Belief of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as delivered in the Creed called *Athanasius*'s.

Sol. To this it may be answered, (1) 'Tis not said as necessary to Salvation. (2) In that very *8th* Article the Church doth not absolutely require the Belief of it, but for that, or supposing it may be proved firmly from the Holy Scripture: And that this is the Meaning of the Church of *England* doth appear, *1st.* By the second Question, and Answer in the Form of ordering Priests and consecrating Bishops, set forth by Authority, where it is apparent that the Person to be ordained Priest is directed by that Form to declare, that he is perswaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all Doctrines required of Necessity to Salvation; and that he hath determined to teach nothing (as required of Necessity to eternal Salvation) but that which he shall be perswaded may be concluded and proved by the H. Scripture. You may see the like in the Form of consecrating Bishops, the second Question and Answer, and by the fourth Question and Answer, in the publick Form of ordering Priests: The Priest is to promise to drive away all erronious and strange Doctrines, contrary to God's Word: Now I presume that every erronious Doctrine is to be look'd upon as strange, and that we must not retain an erronious Doctrine, because it has been of long standing.

And further, in the fourth Question and Answer, in the Form of consecrating Bishops: The Bishop to be consecrated doth promise to drive away all erronious and strange Doctrine contrary to God's Word, and both privately and publickly to call upon others to do the same.

But

But to end, ſuppoſing but not granting that the Church of *England* had required the Belief of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as delivered in the Creed call'd the *Athanaſian*.

1. She doth not aſſume the Privilege of Infallibility, for then ſhe would be guilty of that which ſhe charges (and that juſtly) as a Crime on the Church of *Rome*.

2. In Article 20 the Church of *England* ſets forth what Authority it is ſhe claims in Matters of Faith, or rather diſclaims what Authority ſhe hath not.

1*ſt*. It's not an Authority to impoſe any thing contrary to the written Word of God. Nor,

2*dly*. An Authority to expound one Place of Scripture that it may be contrary to another; plainly that as the Church ought not to decree any thing contrary to the ſame, ſo beſides the ſame ſhe ought not to decree any thing to be believed for Neceſſity of Salvation.

Now from what hath been ſaid it ſeems to follow, that the Church of *England* doth not require the Belief of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity as delivered in the *Athanaſian* Creed as neceſſary to Salvation. For,

If ſhe baptizeth not into that Faith, if he is ſaid to believe as a Chriſtian Man ought to believe, that declares his Belief of only the Apoſtles Creed, and is thereupon owned as a Chriſtian Brother; if thereby he is ſaid to believe in God; to believe all the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith; if the Perſon to be confirmed renews only a Promiſe to believe the Apoſtles Creed; if the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity is not to be believed by being in the 39 Articles, or by their being ſubſcribed to, they being no Articles of Faith, as by the Title of them and Preface before them is evident, no Perſon being baptized into them. And the ſixth Article being a Key to all the reſt, and ſhewing us very plainly how far they are to be believed; and if whatſoever elſe is before aſſerted is evidently to be ſeen, it appears for thoſe Reaſons, that the Doctrine of the Trinity, as ſet down in the *Athanaſian* Creed, is not ſuch an Article of Faith, in the Opinion of the Church, as is neceſſarily to be believed in order to eternal Salvation. Thus, Sir, according to my mean Ability, I have faithfully and conſcientiouſly diſcharged my Promiſe, and beg the Favour of a Line, if this come ſafe to your Hands. I am,

Sir,

Yours,

FINIS.

Mr. CHILLINGWORTH's

JUDGMENT

OF THE

RELIGION

OF

Protestants, &c.

[1692]

THE

PREFACE.

I *Presume, there's no Protestant acquainted in any measure with Books that defend his Religion against the Papists, who has not a high Esteem of Mr.* Chillingworth's *Book, entitulad,* The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation: *a Man singled out from among all the learned Men of those times, as best qualified for that Undertaking against a most learned Jesuit. His Book in order to Printing, was not only approved of by those of greatest Learning and Authority in the Church, but was commended to the Press by the Suffrages of the then Vice-Chancellor, and both the King's and* Margaret *Professors of Divinity in the University of* Oxon; *and since its Publication has had the highest Commendations of most, if not all learned Protestants, as the most learned and judicious Work of any that had been published before upon that Subject. It was first printed in the Year* 1637. *and dedicated to King* Charles *the First; and then reprinted* 1663. *and for more common Use made shorter, by leaving out personal Matters; was printed again* Anno 1684. *as a most rational Defence against Popery, then breaking in upon us like a Land-Flood.*

Out of this excellent Book I have collected these excellent Passages which give a brief Account of the Religion of Protestants, what it is; what Errors are dangerous, what not; that differing Protestants agree in all things necessary to Salvation; that it's Unchristian to use Force in Matters merely Religious; what is the Fountain of all the Schisms of the Church, and the Calamities that have infested Christendom *about Opinions in Religion; and that universal Liberty well moderated is the way to reduce Christians to Truth and Unity.*

Of

Of the Religion of Protestants.

Question. Now, my Friend, Sir, I know that when I by the Religion of Protestants is to Foreigners to be plain, I do not understand by your Religion the Doctrine of *Luther* or *Calvin*, or any other private Man amongst you; nor the Tenets of the *Lutherans* or *Calvinists*, or of the Dominicans, or of any other particular Company amongst you, but the Doctrine of all agree, as *Protestants*, to express, *The Doctrine of the Church of England*, so accordingly on the other side, by the Religion of *Protestants*, I do not understand the Opinions of any particular Men, or Assemblies, nor the Confession of the *Church of Geneva*, nor the Confession of the *Dutch*, nor the Articles of the Church of *Ireland*, nor, lastly, the Harmony of Protestant Confessions; but that wherein they all agree, and which they all subscribe with a greater Harmony, as a perfect Rule of their Faith and Actions; that is, the BIBLE, the BIBLE, I say the BIBLE only is the Religion of Protestants! Whatsoever else they believe besides it, and the plain irrefragable, indubitable Consequences of it, such may they hold it as a Matter of Opinion, but not as a Matter of Faith and Religion; neither can they with Conscience to their own Grounds believe it themselves, nor require the Belief of it of others, without most high and most sophisticated Presumption. I, for my part, after a long (and as I verily believe and hope) impartial Search of *the true way to Eternal Happiness*, do profess plainly, that I cannot find any Rest for the Sole of my Foot, but upon this Rock only. I see plainly and with mine own Eyes, that there are Popes against Popes, Councils against Councils, some Fathers against other, the same Fathers against themselves, in Consents of Fathers of one Age, against a Consent of Fathers of another Age; the Church of one Age against the Church of another Age; nothing but Interpretations of Scripture are against us, but there are few or none to be found: No Tradition but what of Scripture can derive it self from the Romans, but were it plainly proved, either to have been brought in, in such an Age, after Christ, or that it was in one Age, it was not in another, there is no sufficient Certainty but of the Scriptures only, for any considerate Man to build upon. Therefore, as I said before, such will I be, Gentlemen, to this religion; this I will profess, Gentlemen, to this I will live, and for this, if there be Occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly lose my Life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me any thing out of this Book, and require whether I believe it or no; and form it never so incomprehensible to humane Reason, I will subscribe it with Hand and Heart, as knowing no Demonstration can be stronger than this, *God hath said it, therefore it is true.* In other things I will give no Man's Liberty of Judgment from him, neither shall any Man take mine from me; I will think no man the worse Man or the worse Christian; I will love no Man the less for differing in Opinion from me; and what measure I meet to others, I expect from them again: I am fully assured that God does not, and therefore that Men ought not to require any more of any Man than this. To believe the Scripture to be God's Word, to endeavour to find the true Sense of it, and to live according to it.

N. 57. This is the Religion which I have chosen, after a long Deliberation, and I am verily

verily persuaded that I have chosen wisely, much more wisely than if I had guided my self according to your Church Authority; for the Scripture being all true, I am secured by believing nothing else, but what I shall believe no Hallowed Matter of Faith: And if I mistake the Sense of Scripture, and so fall into Error, yet I am secure from any Danger thereby, if but your Grounds be true; because endeavouring to find the true Sense of Scripture, I suppose that hold my Error without Pertinacy, and be ready to forsake it, when a more true and a more probable Sense shall appear unto me. And then all necessary Truth being, as I have proved, plainly set down in Scripture, I am certain by believing Scripture to believe all necessary Truths, and he that does so, if his Life be answerable to his Faith, how is it possible he should fail of Salvation?

Scripture the only Rule whereby to judge of Controversies.

C*Hap. 2. N. 11.*——*To speak properly* (as Men should speak when they write of Controversies in Religion) *the Scripture is not a Judge of Controversies, but a Rule only, and the only Rule for Christians to judge them by:* Every Man is to judge for himself with the Judgment of Discretion, and to chuse either his Religion first, and then his Church, as we say, or as you, his Church first, and then his Religion. But by the Consent of both sides, every Man is to judge and chuse; and the Rule whereby he is to direct his Choice, if he be a natural Man, is Reason; if he be already a Christian, Scripture, which we say is the Rule to judge all Controversies by, yet not all simply, but all the Controversies of Christians, of those that are already agreed upon this first Principle, that *the Scripture is the Word of God.* But that there is any Man, or any Company of Men, appointed to be Judge for all Men, that we deny; and that I believe you will never prove.

Every Man to judge for himself in Matters of Religion.

C*HAP. 2. N. 14.* In Civil and criminal Causes the Parties have for the most part so much Interest, and very often so little Honesty, that they will not submit to a Law, though never so plain, if it be against them; or will not see it to be against them, though it be never so plainly; Whereas if Men were honest, and the Law were plain and extended to all Cases, there would be little need of Judges. Now in Matters of Religion, when the Question is, Whether every Man be a fit Judge and Chuser for himself; we suppose Men honest, and such as understand the Difference between Holiness and Eternity; and such Men, we conceive, will think it highly concerns them to be of the true Religion, but nothing at all that this or that Religion should be the true: And then we suppose that all the necessary Points of Religion are plain and easy, and consequently every Man in this Case to be a competent Judge for himself; because it concerns himself to judge right as much as Eternal Happiness is worth; and if through his own Default he judge amiss, he alone shall suffer for it.

Ch. 3. N. 91.——If they [Men] would be themselves, and be content that others should be, in the choice of their Religion, the Servants of God and not of Men; if they would allow, that the Way to Heaven is no narrower now than Christ left it, his Yoak no heavier than he made it; that the Belief of no more Difficulties is required now to Salvation, than was in the Primitive Church; that no Error is in itself destructive, and exclusive from Salvation now, which was not then; if instead of being zealous Papists, earnest Calvinists, rigid Lutherans, they would become themselves, and be content that others should be plain and honest Christians; if all Men would believe the Scripture, and freeing themselves from Prejudice and Passion, would sincerely endeavour to find the true Sense of it, and live according to it, and require no more of

others but to do so, nor denying their Communion to any that do so; would so order their publick Service (as God) that all which do so may without Scruple or Hypocrisy, or Protestation against any Part of it, join with them in it; who does not see that (seeing as we suppose here, and shall prove hereafter) all necessary Truths are plainly and evidently set down in Scripture) there would of necessity be among all Men, In all things necessary, Unity of Opinion? And notwithstanding any other Differences that are or could be, Unity of Communion, and Charity, and mutual Toleration; by which means all Schism and Heresy would be banished the World, and those Wretches Conventicles which now rend and tear in pieces not the Coat, but the Members and Bowels of Christ, which nourish Idle and Tyranny, and cursing, killing and damning, would infinitely immediately should speedily receive a most dreadful Catastrophe. But of this hereafter, when we shall come to the Question of Schism, wherein I persuade my self that I shall plainly shew, that the most vehement Accusers are the greatest Offenders, and that they are indeed at this time the greatest Schismaticks, who make the Way to Heaven narrower, the Yoke of Christ heavier, the Differences of Faith greater, the Conditions of Ecclesiastical Government harder and stricter, than they were made at the Beginning by Christ and his Apostles; they who talk of Unity, and aim at Tyranny, and will have Peace with none but with their Slaves and Vassals.

Pref. N. 30. ——— For what one Conclusion is there in the whole Fabrick of my Discourse, that is not naturally deducible out of this one Principle; *That all things necessary to Salvation are evidently contained in the Scriptures?* Or what one Conclusion almost of Importance is there in your Book, which is not by this one clearly confutable? Grant this, and it will presently follow, in opposition to your first Conclusion, and the Argument of your first Chapter, That amongst Men of different Opinions, touching the obscure and controverted Questions of Religion, such as may with Probability be disputed on both sides (and such are the Disputes of Practisers) good Men and Lovers of Truth of all sides may be saved, because all necessary things being supposed evident, controversal there, and not to be disputed, there will be no Difference, there being no more cause that a Point is not evident, than that men are not understanding and indifferent Men, who such as give themselves Liberty of Judgment, after a mature Consideration of the Matter, differ about it.

Of disagreeing Protestants.

Ans. to Pref. N. 28. 1. The most disagreeing Protestants that are, yet thus far agree, that those Books of Scripture which were never doubted of in the Church, are the undoubted Word of God, and a perfect Rule of Faith. 2. That the Sense of them which God intended, whatsoever it is, is certainly true; so that they believe implicitly even those very Truths against which they err; and why an implicit Faith in Christ and his Word should not suffice as well as an implicit Faith in your Church, I have desired to be resolved by many of your side, but never could. 3. That they are to use their best Endeavours to believe the Scripture in the true Sense, and to live according to it. This, if they perform (as I hope many on all sides do) truly and sincerely, it is impossible but that they should believe aright in all things necessary to Salvation, that is, in all those things that pertain to the Covenant between God and Man in Christ; for so much is not only plainly, but frequently contained in Scripture; and believing aright the Covenant, if they for their Part perform the Condition required of them, which is sincere Obedience, why should they not expect that God will perform his Promise, and give them Salvation? For, as for other things which lie without the Covenant, and are therefore less necessary, if by reason of the seeming Conflict which is oftentimes between Scripture, Reason, and Authority on the one side, and Scripture, Reason, and Authority on the other; if by reason of the Variety of Tempers, Abilities, Educations, and unavoidable Prejudices, whereby Men Understandings,

derſtandings are variouſly formed and faſhioned, they do embrace ſeveral Opinions, whereof ſome muſt be erroneous: to ſay that God will damn them for ſuch Errors, who are Lovers of him, and Lovers of Truth, is to rob Man of his Comfort, and God of his Goodneſs; it is to make Man deſperate, and God a Tyrant.

Ib. N. 27. That it is ſufficient for any Man's Salvation, that he believe the Scripture; that he endeavour to believe it in the true Senſe of it as far as concerns his Duty; and that he conform his Life unto it, either by Obedience or Repentance. He that does ſo, (as all Proteſtants, according to the *Doctrine* of their Religion, ſhould do ſo) may be ſecured that he cannot err Fundamentally; ſo that notwithſtanding their Differences, and your Preſumption, *the ſame Heaven may receive them both.*

Ib. N. 30. Who can find fault with him [Dr. *Potter*] for ſaying, If through want of Means of Inſtruction, incapacity, invincible or probable Ignorance, a Man die not knowing he may be ſaved; but if he were unwilling to find it, and doth ſeek and will not, ſtraight forward I will ſay that his Caſe is dangerous, and without Repentance deſperate?

Ch. 3. *N.* 8. Methinks, with much more Reaſon, and much more Charity, you muſt ſuppoſe that many of theſe Controverſies which are now diſputed among Chriſtians, (all which profeſs themſelves Lovers of Chriſt, and truly deſirous to know his Will and do it) are either not *decidable* by that Means which God hath provided, and ſo not neceſſary to be decided; or if they be, yet *not ſo plainly and evidently*, as to oblige Men to hold one way: Or laſtly, if decidable, and evidently decided, yet you may hope that the erring Part, by reaſon of ſome Veil before their Eyes, *ſome excuſable Ignorance, or unavoidable Prejudice,* does not ſee the Queſtion to be decided againſt him, and ſo oppoſes not that which he doth know to be the Word of God, but only that which you know to be ſo, and which he might know, were he void of Prejudice: which is a Fault, I confeſs, but a Fault which is incident even to good and honeſt Men very often; and not of ſuch a Quality as you make it, to fly directly upon God Almighty, and to give him the Lie to his Face.

Of the Neceſſity of a viſible Judge in Controverſies of Religion, as well as in Civil Matters.

CH. 2. N. 17.—In Civil Controverſies we are obliged only to external Paſſive Obedience, and not to an internal and active. We are bound to obey the Sentence of the Judge, or not to reſiſt it, but not always to believe it juſt. But in Matters of Religion, ſuch a Judge is required whom we ſhould be obliged to believe to have judged right. So that in Civil Controverſies every honeſt underſtanding Man is fit to be a Judge; but in Religion none but he that is infallible.

In Civil Matters there is always Need and Power, after the Judge has decreed, to compel Men to obey his Sentence; otherwiſe I believe Lawmakers would never have provided for the ending of Differences, as Laws and Judges both. But all the Power in the World is neither fit to command, nor able to compel a Man's Conſcience to conſent to any thing. Worldly Terror may prevail ſo far as to make Men profeſs a Religion which they believe not, (ſuch Men, I mean, who know not that there is a Heaven provided for Martyrs, and a Hell for thoſe that diſſemble ſuch Truths as are neceſſary to be profeſſed) but to force either any Man to believe what he believes not, or any honeſt Man to diſſemble what he does believe, (if God commands him to profeſs it) or to profeſs what he does not believe, all the Powers in the World are too weak, with all the Powers of Hell to aſſiſt them.

7. In Civil Matters it is impoſſible *Titius* ſhould hold the Land in queſtion, and *Sempronius* too; and therefore either the Plaintiff muſt injure the Defendant by diſquieting his Poſſeſſion, or the Defendant wrong the Plaintiff, by keeping his Right from him. But in Controverſies of Religion the Caſe is otherwiſe; I may hold my Opinion, and do you no

[illegible] Worship, and your Sports, and do the [illegible] Nothing may both on the [illegible] and [illegible] do, our selves, no harm, provided the Difference be not touching any thing necessary to Salvation, and that we love Truth so well, as to be diligent to inform our Conscience, and constant in following it.

Concerning Errors damnable, or not damnable.

CH. 3. N. 50. I answer, that these Differences between Professants concerning Errors damnable, and not damnable, Truths fundamental, and not fundamental, may be easily reconciled; for either the Error they speak of may be *purely and simply involuntary*, or it may be, in respect of *the Cause of it*, voluntary: If the Cause of it be some voluntary and avoidable Fault, the Error is it self sinful, and consequently in its own Nature damnable; as if by Negligence in seeking the Truth, by Unwillingness to find it, by Pride, by Obstinacy, by desiring that Religion should be true which suits best with my Ends, by Fear of Men ill Opinion, or any other worldly Fear, or any worldly Hope, I betray my Will to any Error contrary to any Divine revealed Truth, then Error may be justly stiled a Sin, and consequently of it self to such an one damnable. But if I be guilty of none of these Faults, but be desirous to know the Truth, and diligent in seeking it, and advise not at all with Flesh and Blood about the Choice of my Opinions, but only with God, and that Reason that he hath given me: If I be thus qualified, and yet through humane Infirmity fall into Error, this Error cannot be damnable. Again, the Party erring, may be conceived either to die with Contrition, for all his Sins known and unknown, or without it: If he die without it, this Error in it self, if damnable, will be likewise so unto him; if he die with Contrition, (as his Error can be no Impediment but he may) his Error, though in it self damnable to him, according to your Doctrine, will not prove so.

Of Wars for or against Religion.

CH. 4. N. 18. But they endeavoured to force the Jews to Christ, *which were Heretics, to be broken and reformed, as they term it*; and if it was just, they did, *when they had Power, drive their Enemies, into their Superiors, both spiritual and temporal, as it universum*. The Proofs hereof are wanting, and therefore I might defer my Answer until they were produced, yet take this before hand: If they did so, then herein, in my Opinion, they did amiss; for I have learnt, from the ancient Fathers of the Church, that *nothing is more against Religion, than to force Religion*; and of St. *Paul*, *The Weapons of the Christian Warfare are not carnal*: And great Reason; for humane Violence may make Men counterfeit, but cannot make them believe, and is therefore fit for nothing, but to breed Form without, and Atheism within. Besides, if this Means of bringing Men to embrace any Religion were generally used, (as if it may be justly used in any Place, by those that have Power, and think they have Truth, certainly they cannot with Reason deny, but that it may be used in every Place by those that have Power as well as they, and think they have Truth as well as they) what could follow but the Maintenance perhaps of Truth, but perhaps only of the Profession of it in one Place, and the Oppression of it in an hundred? What will follow from it, but the Preservation perhaps of Unity, but peradventure only of Uniformity in particular States and Churches; but the Immortalizing the greater and more lamentable Divisions of Christendom and the World? And therefore what can follow from it, but perhaps in the Judgment of carnal Policy, the temporal Benefit and Tranquillity of temporal States and Kingdoms, but the infinite Prejudice, if not the Dissolution of the Kingdom of Christ? And therefore it well becomes them who have their Portion in this Life, who serve no higher State than that of *England*, or *Spain*, or *France*, nor this neither, any further than they may serve themselves by it; who think of no other Happiness

but

but the Preservation of their own Fortunes and Tranquillity in this World; who think of no other Means to preserve States but humane Power and Machiavilian Policy, and believe no other Creed but this, *Regi an Civitati Imperium habenti nihil injustum quod nolit!* Such Men as these it may become to maintain by worldly Power and Violence, their State-Instrument, Religion: For if all be vain and false (as in their Judgment it is) the present whatsoever, is better than any, because it is already settled: An Alteration of it may draw with it Change of States, and the Change of State the Subversion of their Fortunes; but they that are indeed Servants and Lovers of Christ, of Truth, of the Church, and of Mankind, ought, with all Courage, to oppose themselves against it as a common Enemy of all these.

They that know there is a King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, by whose Will and Pleasure Kings and Kingdoms stand and fall; they know that to no King or State any thing can be profitable which is unjust, and that nothing can be more evidently unjust, than to force weak Men by the Profession of a Religion which they believe not, to lose their own eternal Happiness, out of a vain and needless Fear, least they may possibly disturb their temporal Quietness, there being no Danger to any State from any Man's Opinion, unless it be such an Opinion by which Disobedience to Authority or Impiety is taught or hearten'd; which sort I confess may justly be punish'd as well as other Faults; or unless this Imaginary Doctrine be joined with it, That it is lawful for him by humane Violence to enforce others to it.

Chap. 4. N. 16. This presumptuous imposing of the Senses of Men upon the Words of God, the special Senses of Men upon the general Words of God, and laying them upon Mens Consciences together under the equal Penalty of Death and Damnation: This vain Conceit, that we can speak of the things of God better than the Words of God; this deifying our own Interpretations, and tyrannous enforcing them upon others; this collecting of the Word of God, from that Learnedness and Generality, and the Understandings of Men from that Liberty, wherein Christ and the Apostles left them, *Tit. 2.* and hath been the only Fountain of all the Schisms of the Church, and that which makes them immortal: the common Incendiary of *Christendom*, and that which (as I said before) mars in pieces not the Coat, but the Bowels and Members of Christ, *Ridente Turca, aut deludente Judæo*; take away these Walls of separation, and all will quickly be one. Take away this *Persecuting, Burning, Cursing, Damning* Spirit, for not subscribing to the Words of Men, as the Words of God; it requires of Christians only to believe Christ, and to call no Man Master but him only; let those leave claiming Infallibility, that have no Title to it; and let them that in their Words disclaim it, disclaim it likewise in their Actions. In a word, take away Tyranny, which is the Devil's Instrument to support Errors and Superstitions, and improves in the several Parts of the World, which could not otherwise long withstand the Power of Truth.

I say, take away Tyranny, and restore Christians to their full and full Liberty of captivating their Understanding to Scripture only; and as Rivers, when they have a free Passage, run all to the Ocean; so it may well be hoped by God's Blessing, this universal Liberty thus moderated, may quickly reduce *Christendom* to Truth and Unity. Those Thoughts of Peace (I am persuaded) may come from the God of Peace, and to his Blessing I recommend them.

* *This Perspicuous is no Singularity of mine, but the Doctrine which I have learned from Divines of great Learning and Judgment. Let the Reader be pleased to peruse the seventh Book of Bucer de Scan. Ecclesiæ, & Zanch. de Scripturis, & Ouetius delivered by him after the composing of the Discord between him and Arminius, and which consists in such much.*

FINIS.

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE EXPLICATIONS OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY,

By Dr. *Wallis*, Dr. *Sherlock*, Dr. *S—th*, Dr. *Cudworth*, and Mr. *Hooker*; as also on the Account given by those that say, the Trinity is an Unconceivable and Inexplicable Mystery.

Written to a Person of Quality.

Stephen Nye

Printed in the Year MDCXCIII.

CONSIDERATIONS on the Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, &c.

SIR, 'tis the principal Design of both Testaments, by Confession of all Parties, to establish the Worship and Belief of *one only God*; 'twas for this that all the Books of the *Old* Testament were written, and delivered to the Jews; and for this the *New* was bestowed on the Gentiles.

Of Jews and Gentiles, as the Apostle observes, *There were none that understood, none that sought after* (the true) *God: They were all gone out of the way; they became vain in their Imaginations, and their foolish Heart was darkened: Professing to be wise, they became Fools; and changed the Truth of God into a Lie, by worshipping the Creature, and doing Service to them who were not by Nature Gods.* This was the Condition of both Jews and Gentiles, when first *the Law*, and then *the Light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the Image of God, shone out upon them.* In the Law, the Jews were charged, *Ye shall have no other Gods but ME*: and again, *Thou shalt know no other God but ME.* In the Gospel the Gentiles are taught, *There is one God, and there is none other but He: There is no other God but one; God is one.* Exod. 20. 3. Hosea 13. 4. Mark 12. 32. 1 Cor. 8. 5. Gal. 3. 20.

These, and an hundred more such like, *clear* and *express* Declarations of holy Scripture, have been the occasion, that the Unity of God, or that there is but one God, is the *first* Article of Faith, both with Jews and (true) Christians. From the Christians and Jews, it hath been learned and embraced by all the Mahometans, and is now the general Belief even of the Pagan and Idolatrous Nations: for tho these last own and worship many Gods, yet they (commonly) own but one who is *Supreme, Infinite, Almighty* and *Pre-eternal*; they make the other Deities to be but the *Ministers* of *his* Providence and Will, and their Mediators with *Him*.

But that there is *an* Almighty and All-wise *Mind*, the Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all the Creatures and Kinds in them, we discern plainly by the *Order*, *Beauty* and *Stability* of Things; and more especially, by the admirable *Designs* in the *Whole*, and in all the *Parts* of the Creation: But as this Divine Beauty and Order, and those numberless and most useful Designs, Aims and Ends seen in the Creation, do evince that there is a Thinking, Designing and All-powerful *Mind*, whom we call GOD; so they no way intimate to us, that there is more than one *Creating* and *Governing* Mind, or GOD. They demonstrate to us (beyond exception) that *one* such Mind there is, but not that there is more than one: therefore we may say, that we can own and worship but *one* such Mind, or but one God, *because we know of no more.* Of *one* we are certain, by the *Order* and *Design* of the Parts in the World: of more than one, we have no manner of Proof; therefore we cannot own, or worship, or but talk, or even think of more.

But the Revelation made to us in holy Scripture is Categorical, Apodictical, Express and Direct: there we are told plainly, and in terms, *There is no other God but one; there is one God, and there is none other but He; the Lord thy God, the Lord is one; God is one.*

As this Doctrine is so clearly delivered in Scripture, so *good* Christians have been al-

ways very jealous; that neither directly nor indirectly, neither in express Words nor in Consequence, any thing should be said or held contrary thereto. They have considered, that *Polytheism* and *Atheism* are much the same thing: as 'tis much one to acknowledge, and contend for more Kings of *England*, others besides King *William*, and to renounce or deny him to be King of *England*. Both the Covenants, the Old as well as the New, are between *Us* on the one part, and the one true God on the other part: he covenants to be *our God*, and our *exceeding great Reward*; we covenant to be *his People*, and *his only*: this Covenant is manifestly dissolved, and the *Premium*, or Promise of Eternal Life, annexed to our Faithfulness to this Covenant, is utterly forfeited; if *we* take to our selves any *other*, besides Him with whom we are in covenant, and who alone is true God.

The Guilt of Polytheism, or of affirming more than one God, being so very great; and the Forfeiture thereby made so unspeakable, and the Unity of God being so often and so expressly delivered in holy Scripture; 'tis an amazing Circumstance, that Polytheism is not only found among *Christians*, but is also the more general and prevailing Belief of *Christian* States and Kingdoms. It is true, we all agree in the words, *There is one God, and there is none other but He*: but when we come to explain our selves on these words, the incomparable Majority of *Modern* Christians are found to affirm *three* Gods, and not one only.

One would have thought that these words, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but Me, the Lord thy God is one Lord, thou shalt know no other God but ME, there is none other God but one, God is one*: I say, one would have thought these Declarations to be so plain, and so unconteftable, that a Question could never have arose concerning their meaning. But so it is, that there are a great many Senses given of these Words, which Senses are contrary to, and destructive of one another.

The Doctrine of the Unitarians concerning God.

THE first of these Senses is the Unitarian. For the Unitarians say, *there is none other God but one, God is one*; the plain, obvious and indubitable meaning of these words is this, *there is but One, who is God*, or *a* God: One God, say they, is to be understood in the same *natural, sincere* and *unsophisticated* Sense; as when we say one Sun, one Earth, one World. When the Scriptures, say they, speak to us of so high an Object as God; when they tell us, *there is one God, and there is none other but He*; when they declare this Faith to be the very *first* of all God's Charges, or Commandments to Men; without doubt they speak without *Artifice* or *Quirk*, they have no *double* or *deceitful* meaning; they don't lay *Snares* for us, by intending such a meaning as is contrary to the usual, the grammatical and proper Sense of the Words.

There is but one God, say the Holy Scriptures; where can be the Ambiguity of such usual and plain Words? the meaning of the Terms *One* and *God*, is perfectly known to all Men; Why do we study *Subtilties* and *Finenesses*, with which to deceive our selves into Polytheism, and to destroy the Simplicity of the Faith?

When God says in the first Commandment, *Thou shalt have no other God but Me*, he speaks to all Men, to the *illiterate*, to the *sincere*, and even to *Children*, as well as to those who are practised in the Arts of deceiving and being deceived, by a *Disguise* of Words, and by *captious* Forms of speaking. If his meaning therefore was, there is an Almighty *Father*, who is God; he hath an Almighty *Son*, who also is a God; and besides these, there is an Almighty Spirit *distinct* from the other two, and

and a God no less than either of them; if (I say) this was his meaning, would he have couched it in such words as these, *There is none other God but one?* or in these, *There is one God, and there is none other but He?* or would he have said, *Thou shalt have none other God but ME?* Could the Wisdom of God it self find no other words but these, which are so directly contrary to such a meaning, by which to express himself; and that too to those who were utterly uncapable of apprehending such a Sense in them?

These are the words which God spake upon Mount *Sinai*, with Thunders that shook the Earth and Heavens, *I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other God but ME.* They tell us his meaning was, there are *three* Almighty, All-knowing, and Most-good Persons, each of them (singly and *by himself*) God, and all of them jointly *Creators* of all things: Now who would have thought it, that this should be the meaning of *no other God but ME?* Without doubt, the *Words* and the *meaning* are as far from one another, as any the most *contradictory* Propositions can be: and till they can remove this first Commandment out of the way, it will be impossible for Men of Sense to be of the Trinitarian Persuasion; I mean, if they be also sincere, if they suffer not themselves to be *blinded* by the Interests, or *awed* by the (vain) Terrors of the present false World. Our Oppofers themselves grant, that when the *Israelites* first heard this Commandment, they understood it, and could *then* no otherways understand it, as the *Unitarians* now do, namely thus, *Thou shalt never own any other Person as God, but only Me who now speak to thee.* God Almighty suffered this Sense of his Words to pass current for upwards of 1500 Years: But *then*, say they, he sent our Saviour and his Apostles to give another Sense of them; nay, a *contrary* Sense. The Apostles and our Saviour had it in Charge to tell us, that *no other God but Me*, was as much as to say, God the Father, and God *his* Son, and God the Holy Ghost, *three* Divine Persons, each of them Almighty, each of them All-knowing and most Good, and each of them God. But I verily think, had the Apostles indeed pretended *this* to be the Interpretation of the first Commandment, they would not have found a single Person who would have believed or received them. For these good Men had not (nor desired) Penal Laws, Prisons, Confiscations, Deprivations, Exclusions from the common Privileges of the Society, by which to *wrest* Men Minds, to profess, and even to believe that *black is white, and white is black.* It would have been told them by all their Hearers, that the Sense of Words is *inalterable*; and that even the greatest *Miracles* cannot authorize an Interpretation evidently contrary to the Text. If the Speaker had been only a Man, yet the Sense of his Words when actually spoken, can never be changed by any Authority whatsoever: If Heaven and Earth were *miraculously* destroyed to confirm *an Interpretation* that disagrees with the Natural and Grammatical Sense of the Words, it will (for all that) ever remain a *false* Interpretation.

Cardinal *Bellarmine* is extreamly puzled with this Difficulty; he saw plainly, that the first Commandment (and other Texts of the *Law*) is conceived in such words, that the *Israelites* could not think there were *three* Divine Persons, but only one Divine Person. But the Reason, saith he, of *this* was, because the *Israelites* having lived long in a Nation where they owned and worship'd *many* Gods; if they had been told of three *Divine* Persons, (or of God the Father, God *his* Son, and God the Holy Ghost) they would most certainly have apprehended them to be *three Gods*. This, saith the Cardinal, is the Reason why the Doctrine of the Trinity was reserved to the Times of the New Testament. *Bellarm. de Christo, l. 2. c. 6. Notandum est, Deum in veteri Testamento noluisse proponere Mysterium Trinitatis expresse, quia Judæi incapaces erant, & quia recens exierant de Egypto, ubi colebantur multi Dii, & intraturi erant in terram Chanaan, ubi etiam multi habebantur Dii, ut videlicet putarent, sibi tres Deos propius colendos: voluisse tamen Deum adumbrare hoc Mysterium,*

"cum in *Novo Testamento* prædicaretur, non vi-"detur omnino *Novum*. q. d. "The Doctrine "of the Trinity was not propounded ex-"pressly to the Jews in the Old Testament; "they were uncapable of it, because coming "out of *Egypt* where many Gods were wor-"shipped, and entering into *Canaan* where "also many Gods were acknowledged, the "Jews would have thought that *three* Gods "had been propounded to them to be wor-"shipped. Nevertheless it was *hinted*, or "*shadowed* to them, lest when it came to be "preached in the New Testament, it should "seem altogether a newthing.

In reading the Works of this Cardinal, I have often had this Thought, That provided his Works were but bulky and learned, he never cared what other Property they wanted: no one can deny that his *five* Books against the Unitarians, intituled by him *De Christo*, are the most *learned* of any that have been written against us; but they have no *Wit*, and are (throughout) most *injudicious*. What can be more unthought or silly, for instance, than this *vain* Elusion? God speaks to the Jews, saith he, as if he were but one Person, because they (living among People who acknowledged many Gods) would have mistaken *three* Divine Persons to be *three* Gods. How came it to be more safe or seasonable, or less liable to a Misinterpretation, to instruct Christians in the Belief of *three* Divine Persons, than it would have been to teach the same Belief to the Jews? The Jews, saith the Cardinal, would have mistaken, they would have thought the *Trinity* (an Almighty Father, an Almighty Son, and an Almighty Spirit) to be *three* Almighties, and *three* Gods; so this Mystery was not *preached* to them. What a Narrowness of Thought and Consideration is implied in this Answer; for, was not the whole *Christian* Church taken from among such Nations, who *all* worshipped and owned *many* Gods? The Reason alledged by the Cardinal, if it were good for any thing, must also have prevented the Revelation of that (pretended) Mystery to any of the Christian Nations and Churches.

I might also ask the Cardinal, why he hath so much better Thoughts of *Athanasius*, than of *Moses*, and the Prophets? *Athanasius* knew how to compose a Trinitarian Creed, in the most *express* and particular manner, that might be delivered out to all the Churches, without the least danger of leading them into any Mistake about it: but *Moses* and the Prophets, tho inspired by God, wanted this Dexterity. They, poor Men, were forced to speak (falsly) of God, as if he were but one Person, not a Trinity of Persons, lest they should commit some dangerous Blunder in the *wording* of their Doctrine, and so lay an occasion of Polytheism in the way of the Jewish Church; but *Athanasius*, and the Nicene Fathers have happily got over this Difficulty, they have blest the Christian Churches with a *pair* of Creeds, worth an hundred first Commandments.

But to be short; the *Unitarian* Explication of the Texts, wh[illegible] *there is but one God*, is, that *there is but one God*, or but one *Divine* Person, but one who is Almighty, All-knowing, and perfectly Good. Our very Opposers confess that this was the *antient* and *first* Sense of the Words, so the Faithful understood them for 1300 Years together. They confess too, 'tis a very *Natural* and a very *Rational* Sense; that it hath no Difficulties, no Mysteries or Monstrosities in it. They are constrained also to own, that the before mentioned Texts alledged by the Unitarians, are so *read* in all Copies both of the Hebrew and Greek, and can no other ways be *readed* from the *Original* Text; or more clearly thus, as to these Texts there is no Variety or *Difference* in the *reading*, in the Copies of the *Original*, nor any *Uncertainty* in the *Translations* of those Copies. This is a very great matter, and cannot be said, nor is so much as pretended, for the Texts are urged by Trinitarians; they have been often challenged to produce but one Text for their Doctrine of the Trinity: but either 'tis otherwise *read* in the most Antient and Eminent Copies of the Greek and Hebrew, or 'tis easily and naturally render'd and

translated

translated to another Sense; or 'tis given up by their own (ablest) Interpreters and Criticks, as wholly impertinent, and no Proof of the Doctrine in question. From these confest and acknowledg'd Premises, we have these two necessary and unavoidable Consequences. 1. That the Account which the Unitarians give of God, and his Unity, is *the very Voice of Nature and Reason*, supported by such Texts of holy Scripture, as have neither *Uncertainty* nor *Ambiguity*. 2. That the Trinitarian Faith is at best but precarious, uncertain and doubtful; because it is not only disclaimed by Reason, but it hath no other Scripture-Proofs but such, concerning which there is no Certainty, either how they are to be *read* in the Originals, or how they are to be *translated* from the Originals into the Modern Languages. No Faith or Doctrine whatsoever can be more certain than the Proofs are on which 'tis grounded: if those Proofs are of *suspected* Authority and Credit, or of *uncertain* meaning and sense, the Doctrine it self must be altogether uncertain, suspicious and precarious. But because you expect from me a Letter, not a Volume, I will say no more now of the *Unitarian* Hypothesis, but will briefly (as I can) compare and consider the Hypotheses, or *Explications* advanced by our Opposers.

Of the Explication by Dr. J. Wallis.

ALL Men know, that the Difference between the Unitarians and their Opposers the Trinitarians, is (in few words) this, Whether there be more than one *Divine* Person, or more than one Person, who is true and most High God? The Unitarians say there can be but one Divine Person; because, not to mention the Scripture-Proofs of it, *a Divine Person* being as much as to say *a Divinity*, or a God; if you say, there are more Divine Persons, you *thereby* and *thereby* say there are more Gods. As three *Angelical* Persons are three *Angels*, and three *Human* Persons are three *Men*; so three *Divine* Persons in Grammar and common Sense, are three *Divinities*; which (all grant) is as much as to say *three Gods*. So they. But, saith Dr. *Wallis*, "Here's a "reasoning why 'tis grounded on this silly "Mistake, that a *Divine* Person is as much "as to say a *Divinity*, or a God; when indeed a *Divine* Person is only a *Mode*, a "Respect, or Relation of God to his Creatures. He beareth to his Creatures these "three Relations, Modes, or Respects, that "he is their *Creator*, their *Redeemer*, and their "*Sanctifier*: this is *what* we mean, and *all* "we mean, when we say God is *three Persons*; "he hath those three Relations to his Creature, and is thereby no more three Gods, "than he was three Gods to the Jews, because he calleth himself the God of *Abraham*, the God of *Isaac*, and the God of "*Jacob*.

"Three *Human* Persons, say the Socinians, "are *tres Homines*, or *three Men*, and three "*Angelical* Persons are three *Angels*; therefore three *Divine* Persons are, in Grammar "and common Sense, three *Divinities*, or "Gods: Where, I pray, did they learn this "Stuff? Not from *Tully*; that learned Orator, and great Master and Director of elegant and proper speaking, would have "taught them, that *a Human Person* is not "as much as to say *Man*, or *a Man*, but is "a *Qualification*, a *Capacity*, a *Respect*, or "*Relation* of one Man to other Men. *Sustineo unus tres Personas*, saith *Tully*; i. e. *I being but one Man do sustain* (or am) *three Persons, that of my self, that of my Adversary, and that of a Judge*. See here, one Man "sustains (or is) three *Persons*, an Advocate, "an Accuser, and a Judge, without being "three Men: Why should it be thought incredible, or harsh, to say with the Church,

"three

"three Divine Persons are but one God, "when *Tally* maketh three *Orts Persons* "to be but one Man?

This is the sum of what Dr. *Wallis* hath said in eight printed Letters, and in three Sermons that were preached to the University of *Oxford*.

Sermons that have been preached to the University, and not censured by them, must be supposed to contain nothing *Heretical*, no not Dangerous, Scandalous, or Heterodox. But besides that these Sermons have passed so great a Test, as that of the University of *Oxford*, the Doctor asseareth us, that he hath been thank'd and complemented, in a great number of private Letters, on account of his Sermons and Letters: some of these Letters written to him have been published; and it doth appear, they were indeed written by able Men. We must also take notice of two other Considerations in favour of these Letters and Sermons of Dr. *Wallis*: the first is, that Dr. *S—th* (Author of the Animadversions on Dr. *Sherlock*) having taken particular notice of the Letters written *by* and *to* Dr. *Wallis*, speaks respectfully of the Authors of them, calling them *Reverend*, and *very Learned* Persons, without making the least Reflection on his Doctrine, as Heretical, or as Heterodox. The second is, Dr. *Sherlock* himself, tho Dr. *Wallis* had *very ill* said in his Answer to *W. J.* that Dr. *Sherlock*'s Doctrine doth imply *Tritheism*, and that so much had been proved upon him by *W. J.* yet does Dr. *Sherlock*, who is so little wonted to carry Coals, pass by this Affront and Imputation which no Clergy-man ought to bear; nay he even favors upon the *Oxford* Doctor, in his late Answer to *the Scandalous*.

But a very surprizing thing hath happened; Dr. *Wallis* writes in Defence of the Trinity and the Athanasian Creed; his Explications are allowed by the University of *Oxford*, and even applauded by great numbers of Learned Men who profess to be Trinitarians; and yet after all, the Socinians in their *Observations on the Letters of Dr. Wallis*, profess that they are of his Mind; they even say, that in Honour of him they are content to be called *Wallisians*. This is very odd; for it follows, that either the Socinians are the true *Orthodox*, and their Opposers, *Tritheists*, or else that *this good Doctor is a Socinian, and knows it not*.

Those that say, without doubt the Socinians understand their own Doctrine, are very peculiar upon Dr. *Wallis*; they pretend themselves very desirous to be informed what might be in the Doctor's Mind, to apologize for the Athanasian Creed and the Trinity, and yet to asserte at the same time his own Patriarch *Socinus*, and his dear and close Friends and Brethren the Unitarians; especially in such an hainous manner as we see in his *third* and *fourth* Letters. They say, either the Man is *Wood*, or he has written after that fashion, only to give occasion to the Socinians, as in effect it also happened, to appear more bright, by a chorow and unanswerable Vindication of themselves; for so it is, that wounded Innocence and Vertue are rendred more conspicuous and lovely, when injurious Calumnies are wiped off.

They say farther, that its not to be much regarded that so many have complemented Dr. *Wallis* for his Letters; for what Assurance have we that the Writers of them are not secret Socinians, and that they only *hearten* the good Doctor? As for the University of *Oxford*, to whom these Sabellian and Unitarian Sermons were preached, tis very usual for the *old* Men that preside in that University, to sleep at Sermons, especially at *dull* ones. But you are not to think, say they, that these Sermons or Letters were ever *offered* to the Press by the University; or that the Doctors there understand so little, as to mistake a disguised Sabellianism or Socinianism, for the Trinity of the Catholick Church.

The *three* Persons, say Dr. *Wallis*, are but three Relations, Capacities, or Respects of God to his Creatures; he is their *Creator*, *Redeemer* and *Sanctifier*; and in this Sense of the word *Person*, God is *three* Persons. But then because God hath also the Capacity or Relation

Relation of a *Judge*, and of an *Ostensorius*, or *Provider*, and many more; we must not say that God is only *three* Persons, he is *five* at the least, besides I know not how many more.

Furthermore, this new-fangled Socinian or Sabellian has introduced a Trinity of Divine Persons, that were but of *yesterday*. The Churches Trinity are all of them from all Eternity; *Co-eternal*, saith the Athanasian Creed; *before all Worlds*, saith the Nicene Creed: but Dr. *Wallis* his three Divine Persons, the first of them begins with the Creation, and the second is no older than the *Crucifixion* of our Saviour; for God was not a *Creator* before he created any thing; nor a *Redeemer*, till those words were spoken by our Saviour on the Cross, *It is finished*, i. e. The great Work of Redemption is accomplished.

The three Divine Persons believed by the Church, begat one another after a wonderful manner: Will Dr. *Wallis*, being the *eldest* Divine of *England*, instruct *Novices* that are desirous to learn, how his Persons begat one another? How did *Creation* beget *Redemption*, and from all Eternity, that is, before either of them were; for *Creation* it self is but Coeval with the World: and how was Sanctification, we must not say *begotten*, for that's Heresy when you speak of a *third* Person; but how did it *proceed* from Creation, and from Redemption?

Dr. *Wallis*, say they, will find it as hard to account for these Difficulties, as to double the Cube, or even to *square* the Circle, which the most learned Mathematicians think to be impossible. He is not, say they, to think that he is Orthodox, because he hath escaped the heavy cudgelling that hath all fallen on Dr. *Sherlock*; 'tis not because his Doctrine, but because his Luck hath been better than that Doctor's. In a word, whereas the Church believes three real *subsisting* Persons, Dr. *Wallis* hath taught a Trinity of *External Denominations*, or *Accidental Predications* only. Creation, Redemption and Sanctification are Acts of God's *free* and *sovereign* Will: he was under no necessity to create, to redeem, or to sanctify; they are all Effects of his most voluntary and every way *free* Love: If therefore the Mystery of the Trinity, so much hitherto contested, be nothing else but Almighty God, considered as the *Maker*, *Redeemer* and *Sanctifier* of his Creatures; 'tis a Trinity only of three Denominations or *Names*, and of *Predications* purely *Accidental*; and besides that, 'tis no manner of *Mystery*, but the most intelligible and obvious thing in the Word; nor was it ever denied, either by Sabellians or Socinians.

Thus it is, Sir, that divers learned Persons speak concerning the Trinity maintained by Dr. *Wallis*: I, for my part, will add nothing to the *Observations* I have formerly made on Dr. *Wallis* his Letters; only (I pray) take notice here with me, how well the *Cadmian Brethren* agree among themselves. Three Divine Persons, saith Dr. *Wallis*, are the three Relations of God to his Creatures; he *made*, he *redeemed*, he *sanctifies* them; this is the Holy Trinity. Out upon it, saith Dr. *Sherlock*, *'tis Nonsense and Horrid hath*; for the Divine Persons are three *Beings*, three *Minds*, three *Spirits*, all of them *living*, *subsisting*, and *conscious* to one another.

No, no, that's as much too much, saith Dr. *S—th*, 'tis neither so nor so, but as I have explained it in my *eighth* Chapter of Animadversions on Dr. *Sherlock*. The Explication of the Trinity by Dr. *Sherlock*, saith Dr. *S—th*, *is a treacherous and a false Defence of that Mystery; he hath advanced a Notion, that immediately and necessarily infers three Gods; and if he had lived in the times of the sixth General Council, he would have incurred the Penalty of Deprivation.* Pref. p. 2, 7, & 8.

Well, I hope Dr. *S—th* hath at length told us the very true Doctrine about the Trinity. Yes, he hath (without question) laid down the very Explication of *the Schools*, the Doctrine or Explication generally received in *Universities*; I doubt not it would be approved by most of the *Chairs* of our European Universities, or Schools of Learning: he hath verily acquitted himself like a Man of

learning and Wit. For all that, Dr. *Cudworth*, in his *Intellectual System*, hath largely and clearly proved these two things; 1. That this Trinity of *the Schools* is quite different from the Trinity held by the *Fathers*, and that by them it would have been reckoned no other than *Sabellianism*. 2. That as the first Inventors of it were *Pitty Lombard* and the Schoolmen; so it hath no other publick Authority, but that of the Fourth *Lateran* Council, held in the Year 1215. He saith, 'tis a gross piece of *Nonsense*; that it falleth not under Human Conceptions, *neither* (saith he) *can it be in Nature*. This is the Judgment, which this great Philosopher and Divine maketh of the Explication propounded and defended in Dr. *S—th's* Animadvertions on Dr. *Sherlock*. And in very deed, Dr. *S—th's* Explication can (fitly and properly) be called by no other Name, but *an absurd Socinianism*, or *Sabellianism* Dr. *Wallis* calls it, as we shall see, when we come to consider it in particular.

Mr. *Hooker*, the celebrated Author of the Ecclesiastical Policy, giveth yet another Explication of the Trinity; he describeth it to be the Divine Essence, distinguished by three *Internal* and *Relative* Properties; this Explication differs as much from Dr. *Wallis* as any of the rest; for Dr. *Wallis's* three Persons are all of them *External* Denominations or Predicaments. But these Differences, Sir, among our Opposers, will appear to you most clearly, without my needing to point at them; in the Accounts I am about to give, of their several Explications of their Trinity, and the Observations I shall make on them. Therefore I pass on to the Explication given us by Dr. *Sherlock*.

Of the Explication by Dr. W. Sherlock.

FOR Memory and Method's sake, and because the Division is *equal*, we may distinguish the Accounts, or Explications of the Trinity contrived by our Opposers, after this manner. There is first, *the Trinity according to Tully*, or the *Ciceronian* Trinity; which maketh the three Divine Persons, to be nothing else but three *Conceptions* of God; or God *conceived of* as the Creator, the Redeemer, and Sanctifier of his Creatures. Dr. *Wallis*, after many others, hath propounded and asserted this Trinity, in his Letters, and his Sermons to the *Patres conscripti* at *Oxford*. He found in *Tully*, *Sustineo unus tres Personas*; of which he mistaketh the meaning to be, *I being but one Man, yet Act three Persons*, saith the Doctor hereupon; Why may not God be three Persons, as well as one Man was three Persons?

The next is the *Cartesian* Trinity, or the *Trinity according to Des Cartes*; which maketh three Divine Persons, and three Infinite *Minds*, *Spirits* and *Beings*, to be but one God; because they are mutually, and internally, and universally *conscious to each others Thoughts*. Mr. *Des Cartes* had made this *Axiom* to be the first Principle and Discovery in Philosophy, *Cogito, ergo sum*; *I think, therefore I am*; and he will have the very Nature of a Mind, or Spirit to consist in this, that it is *a thinking Being*. Therefore, says Dr. *Sherlock*, three Persons can be no otherways one God, but by Unity of Thought, or what will amount to as much, an Internal and Perfect *Consciousness to one another's Thoughts*. Any one may see, that Dr. *Sherlock's* *Mutual-Consciousness*, by which he pretends to explain his *Trinity in Unity*, was by him borrowed from the Meditations and Principles of Monsieur *Des Cartes*; his System was hinted to him, by that unhappy Philosopher who hath razed (as much as in him lay) the only Foundation of Religion, by resolving (so absurdly, as well as impiously) the Original of the World, and of all Things, not into the Contrivance and Power of an Almighty and All-wise Mind,

but

but two the Natural *Tendencies* of Bodies, or as he calls them, *the Laws of Motion*.

The third is *the Trinity of Plato*, or the *Platonick* Trinity, maintained by Dr. *Cudworth*, in his Intellectual System. This Trinity is of three Divine Co-eternal Persons, whereof the second and third are subordinate or inferior to the first, in Dignity, Power, and all other Qualities, except only Duration. Yet they are but one God, saith he; *because* they are not three *Principles*, but only one; the Essence of the Father being the Root, and Fountain of the Son and Spirit; and *because* the three Persons are gathered together under one Head, even the Father. This, saith Dr. *Cudworth*, is the Trinity of *Plato*, and the genuine Platonists; and is the only true Trinity; all other Trinitarians besides the Platonists, are but *Nominal* Trinitarians; and the Trinities they hold are not Trinities of *subsisting* Persons, but either of Names and Denominations only, or of partial and inadequate Conceptions.

The fourth is *the Trinity according to Aristotle*, or the *Aristotelian* or *Peripatetick* Trinity; which finds the Divine Persons are one God, because they have the same *Numerical* Substance, or *one and the self-same Substance in Number*; and tho each of the three Persons is Almighty, All-knowing, and most Good; yet 'tis *by one Individual and self-same Power, Knowledge and Goodness*, in *Number*. This may be called also the *Reformed* Trinity, and the Trinity of *the Schools*; because the Divines of the middle Ages, *reformed* the Tritheistick and Platonick Trinity of the *Fathers*, into this *Sabellian* Larvonity, as Dr. *Cudworth*, often and deservedly, calleth it. This is the Trinity intended by Dr. *S—th*, in his Animadversions on Dr. *Sherlock*, especially as *they* stand. The Author or first Contriver of it, was *Petrus Lombard*, Master of the Sentences, and Bishop of *Paris*, who died in the Year 1164. It never had any other Publick Authority, saith Dr. *Cudworth*, but that of the fourth Lateran Council, which is reckoned by the Papists among the *General* Councils, and was convened in the Year 1215. He might have added, that the Doctrine of *Petrus* was disliked and opposed by divers Learned Men, and censured by *Alexander* the Third, and other Popes; till Pope *Innocent* the Third declared it to be *Orthodox*. It may be not improbably said, that an *Unknown* was the true Parent of it; for 'tis said, that *Petrus Lombard* took his four Books of Sentences, for so much as concerneth the Trinity, out of a Book of *Pa. Abelardus* concerning the same.

In this Trinity (of *Aristotle* and the *Schools*) we must reckon the *Trinity of Properties*, which (we shall see hereafter) is so variously explained, as to make even divers sorts of Trinities; yet I refer all the *Property-Trinities* to this fourth Distinction of Trinities, *the Trinity according to Aristotle*, because they are all grounded on the abstracted or Metaphysical and Logical Notions, of that Philosopher; nor can they be understood, without some Knowledg of his Philosophy.

We must add to all these, *the Trinity of the Abbots*, or the Trinity held by the common People, and by those ignorant or lazy Doctors, who for Compliance with their Lazinesse or their Ignorance, tell you in short, that the Trinity is an unconceivable and therefore an inexplicable *Mystery*; and that those are as much in fault, who presume to explain it, as those who oppose it.

And have propounded to my self, to discourse briefly on all these Trinities. I have begun with the *Trinity of Marcus Tullius Cicero*, or, if he pleases, of Dr. *Wilkins*. I have said of it, as much as is necessary; the next is *the Trinity according to the Philosophy Del Cartes*, but the Discoverer of which is Dr. *Sherlock*.

When Dr. *Sherlock* came out with his *Vindication*, in Answer to the Brief History of the Unitarians, and the Brief Notes on the Creed of *Athanasius*; the more Ignorant of the Doctors and Rectors, and all the young Fry of Lecturers and Readers about Town, were his Hawkers to cry it about, and cry it up. They questioned not, what such a Master in Polemicks had delivered; especially with so much Assurance and Confidence, and with so much Kernesse, and Contempt of the poor

sick

Sociis Nomenclator, and Epitaffer. But the mercheacred among them said from the very first; that indeed Dr. *Sherlock* meant humbly, and he might have propounded this Explication to his *private* Friends, to be considered and debated: but it was liable to too many *obvious* Exceptions, to be published to all the World; without great Corrections, in the manner of Expression.

But the Socinians presently saw their Advantage; and resolved to make use of it: accordingly, in about *five* or *six* Weeks time, out came their *Obstrutions* on the *Vindication* of Dr. *Sherlock*; which in some Editions of them are prefaced, with *the Acts* or Gests of *Arianism*. Here they tell the Doctor, that he hath published a worse Heresy, than even *any* is held to be, by our heretick Opposers; in one word, that he hath revived *Paganism* by such an Explication of the Trinity, as undeniably introduces Tritheism, or three Gods. They show him, that his Error was condemned by the Ancients in the Person of *Philoponus*; and in the middle Ages in the Person and Writings of *Abbat Joachim*; but more lately since, the *Adamantius*, in the Person of *Valentinus Gentilis*; who was condemned at *Geneva*, and beheaded at *Bern*, for this very Doctrine. They demonstrate to him, by a great many unexceptionable Arguments, that a *Sacrum Contubernium* of three (supposed) Divine *Spirits* and *Minds*, having each of them his own peculiar and *Personal* Understanding, Will and Power of Action, is so far from making three such *Spirits* to be *one* God in number; that 'tis the clearest and the certaineſt Demonstration, that they are *three* Gods. Mutual Consciousness maketh them to be a Consult or Council, a Cabal or Senate of Gods, if you will; but by no means, one *Numerical* God, or one God in Number.

The *Obstrutions* of the Socinians opened all Mens Eyes, to see and acknowledg, that Dr. *Sherlock* had greatly overshot the Mark; and that it was necessary, he should yield his Place to some new Opponent, who (in these Disputes with the Socinians) would speak more cautiously. All Endeavours therefore were plied by his Friends, to persuade Dr. *Sherlock* to be quiet; and because such an Example had been made of him, they stopped a while all Sermons and other Tracts, that were going to the Press against the Socinians. The Politicians among them feared the Success of a War, that in its Beginning had been so unsuccessful: they said to one another, we need not trouble our selves with the Socinians; because being Masters of all the Pulpits, we can sufficiently dispose the People to the Orthodox Belief, without the help of *printed* Answers and Replies.

'Tis about three Years, since these *Obstrutions* on Dr. *Sherlock's Vindication* were made publick; and all this time, he hath very peaceably taken the Imputations of *Hippy*, and *Paganism*; tho he had said in the Preface to his Vindication, *That being dispos'd to Peace in the Vindication of so glorious a Cause, by the Grace of God he would never depart it, until he should hold a Pen in his Hand.*

The Socinians did not design to give him any farther Trouble: but Dr. *S*——*th* not able to endure, that such Affections should lie at the Door of the Church, could not restain from declaring to all the World, that the Church had suffered nothing, in the Defeat of Dr. *Sherlock*. He professeth, that the Charge drawn up against Dr. *Sherlock*, by the Socinians, is true; for he hath in very deed advanced an Explication of the Trinity, saith Dr. *S*——*th*, which immediately and unavoidably infers three Gods. Brief. p. 2.

It not being the Design of Dr. *S*——*th*, in his *Animadversions*, to prove the Truth of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; but only to explain or declare it, that is, to notify in what Sense and manner it is held by the Church; we must say, that his Performance is an accurate, and learned Work. He concerneth not himself with the Socinians; but only refutes the received Doctrines of the Church, from the Misrepresentations of them by Dr. *Sherlock*, who either understood them not, or wanted to depart from them. Nor do we concern our selves with Dr. *S*——*th*; but whereas he is the only Writer, since the Revival

rival of these Controversies, who has indeed understood what the Church means by a *Trinity in Unity*; therefore we must take leave to Gr. and will also prove it, that this his *true Explication* of the Trinity, is (for all that) a great *Outrage*, or rather a great piece of Nonsense. Dr. *Sherlock*'s was a Rational and Intelligible Explication, tho not a true one; this not Orthodox, as Orthodoxy is reckoned since the Lateran Council: Dr. *Sherlock*'s not *Orthodox* Explication, or what the Church means when she says, but is neither *Rational*, nor *Intelligible*, nor *possible*. But of that in its *proper* place; for I must first examine *the Trinity according to Plato*, decreed by Dr. *Cudworth*.

Of the Explication by Dr. Cudworth.

IT will be necessary, in the first place, to declare Dr. *Cudworth*'s Explication, more largely and clearly, than hath been yet done. In accounting for the Doctrine of the Trinity, he *professes* to follow the Platonick Philosophers; with whom, saith he (not the *Arians*, as some suppose, but) the Orthodox *Fathers* perfectly agree. These held a Trinity of Divine Persons, Co-eternal indeed, but *not Co-equal*; for the Son and Spirit are inferior to the first Person, or the Father, in Dignity, in Authority, and in Power. They are so many *distinct* Substances; not one numerical Substance, as hath been taught by the School-Doctors, and the Lateran Council. For tho the Fathers say, that the three Persons have but *one* and the *same* Substance, Essence or Nature; they did not mean thereby *one* and the *self-same* Substance or Essence *in Number*, but the same Essence or Substance for *Kind*, or *Nature*. Because each Person of the three, is *Spiritual*, *Eternal*, *Noble*, a *Creator*, and *necessarily-existing*, therefore they were said by the Fathers and Platonists, to have the *same* Nature, Essence or Substance; and not because their Essences or Substances, *Physically* or Properly so called, are one and the same *Physical* Substance *in Number*. In few words, saith he, this famous Term *Consubstantial* (or *of the same Substance*) was never intended by the Platonists, or by the Fathers, to deny (as the Schools do) three distinct individual Essences, or to denote *one Numerical* Substance or Essence; but only to signify, that the Trinity believed by the Orthodox is not made up of *contrary* or *unlike* Natures, (as the *Arian* Trinity is) but of Persons all of them *Rational*, all of them Eternal, Spiritual and Uncreated. They that shall deny this to be the Doctrine of the Fathers, will find themselves obliged to answer to two things, which we indeed (fairly and truly) unanswerable. The first is, why those Fathers who contend for the *same* (consubstantial, or of the *same* Substance) do yet expressly reject the *Same* and *one* *numero*, or of the *same* Substance and Essence *in Number*? The *Same* and *one* *numero*, or of the *same* Essence or Substance in Number, is the very Doctrine of the Schools and Moderns; but is denied by the Fathers, as *inter Substantia*, which invincibly proves, that by *one* and the *same* Substance they meant, not one and the *same*, or one *in Number*, but one for Kind, Nature or Properties. Secondly, they *shuffle* and *shift* the Citations of *Tertullian*, and *S. Cyprian*, and *Clem.* in the Intellectual System; which do all of them severally (and much more commonly) clearly show what the Sense of the Fathers was, about *consubstantial*, and consubstantial.

It appears by this, and abundance more the like, that Dr. *Cudworth* had the same Apprehensions, concerning the three Divine Persons, with Dr. *Sherlock*; they both apprehend the three Persons to be as distinct and different, and as really *three* several Intelligens.

Intelligent *Beings* and *Substances*, as *three* Angels are, or as *Peter*, *James* and *John* are. Dr. *Sherlock* saith, that we use, howsoever called *one* God, because they are *internally* conscious to *all* one another's *Thoughts* and *Actions*: but I do not believe, that Dr. *Cudworth* would have allowed so much to the Son and Spirit, as to be *internally* conscious to *all* the Thoughts and Actions of the first Person; he always speaketh of them, as every way inferior to the Father; he will not allow them to be *Omnipotent* in any other respect, but only *externally*, that is to say, because the Father concurreth *Omnipotently* to all their *internal* Actions, whether of Creation or Providence. Dr. *Cudworth* desires to distinguish his Explication, from all others of the Moderns, by this Mark; that *it* allowedh not the three Persons to be, in any respect but Duration, *Co-equal*: for (saith he) those distinct Intelligent Natures or Essences, each of them Pre-eternal, Self-existent, and *equally* Omnipotent *as intra*, are of necessity three Gods, nor can we have any other Notion of three Gods; but if only the first Person be indeed *internally* Omnipotent, and the other two subordinate in Authority and Power to him, you leave them but one God, only in three Divine Persons.

This is Dr. *Cudworth's* Explication. Every one will readily make this Exception, he thinketh, rather than there is one *Great* God, and *two* Lesser Ones; or else only the first is *true* God, and the other two *in Name* only. The Doctor foresaw, without doubt, this Objection; therefore see, how he hath endeavoured to prevent it. *First*, he reports some Answers of the Fathers, to this Difficulty; which Answers he expressly rejecteth. For some of them said, that the three Persons are one God, *by their Unity of Will and Affection*: Others said, they are one God, as all Men or all Mankind are called *Homo*, or MAN; namely because they All have the same *Specifick* Nature, or Essence, or Substance, even *the Rational*. For as *all Men* have the same *Specifick* Essence or Nature, which is the Rational; so the Divine Persons also agree in one Nature, namely the Eternal, Spiritual and Self-existent. But Dr. *Cudworth* confesseth, that an *Union of Will and Affection* is only a *moral* Union, not a *physical* or *real Unity*; and as three *Human* Persons would be three distinct Men, notwithstanding the *Moral* Union in Affection and Will; so also the three Divine Persons will be three distinct Gods, notwithstanding such an Union in Will and Affection. As to the other, that the three Persons are but one God, by their having the same *Specifick* Nature or Essence; or as some call it Substance, namely because they are all of them Spiritual, Self-existent, and Co-eternal; he calleth it *an absurd Paradox*, contrary to common Sense, and our common Notions of things: for so *all* Men will be but *one* Man, because they have the same Specifick Essence or Nature, namely *the Rational*; and all *Epicures* his (Extramundane) Gods will be but one God.

Then, he propoundeth divers other Explications, which he neither approveth, nor expressly rejecteth, tho'tis plain that he disliked them: for the Explication on which he insisteth, and which appears to be his Sense of the matter, is this: that *this* follows, The *three* Divine Persons are *one* God, *because they are not three Principles*, but only one; the Essence of the Father, being the Root, and Fountain of the Son and Spirit; and because the three Persons are gathered together *under one Head or Chief*, even the Father. He adds here expressly, that if the Persons were co-ordinate, (*i. e.* equal in Authority, Dignity, or Power) they should not be one, but three Gods.

This is at large Dr. *Cudworth's* Opinion: the short of it is, that the three Persons are as really *distinct* Beings, Essences, or Substances, as Dr. *Sherlock* hath imagined them to be. And as their Substances or Natures are not one, but three; so also must their *Understandings*, and other Personal Powers and Properties. The Doctors differ only in this, that Dr. *Sherlock* maketh the Unity of the three Persons, in the Godhead, to consist in the *Mutual-Consciousness* of the Persons;

Bur

But Dr. *Cudworth* in this, that the Father is both the *Principle* (Root or Fountain or Cause) and also the *Head* of the other two Persons. They neither of them believe one *Numerical* but one *Collective God*: one God, not who is *really* one God, but is one God *in certain Respects*; as of Mutual Consciousness, or of being the Cause, Principle and Head of all other Beings, and of the second and third Persons.

Dr. *Cudworth* contends by a great number of very *Pertinent* and *Home* Quotations; that his Explication (I mean, that part of it which makes the three Persons, to be so many distinct Essences or Substances) is the Doctrine of the Principal, if not of all the *Fathers*, as well as of the *Platonists*: and I (for my own part) do grant it. For I am perswaded, that no Man hath read the Fathers, with Judgment and Application, but he must discern; that tho they do not express themselves in the incautious, unwary and obnoxious Terms used by Dr. *Sherlock*, as neither doth Dr. *Cudworth*, yet the Fathers as much believed the three Persons are distinct *Minds* and *Spirits*, as Dr. *Sherlock* doth; all the Difference (as I said) is only this, that *he* and Dr. *Cudworth* do not use his very Terms. They do not say in express words, three *Minds* or three *Spirits*; but the *Comparisons* which they use, and *their Definitions* or Descriptions of what they mean by *Persons*, are such, that it cannot be questioned by any, that they apprehended the three Persons, to be three distinct *Spirits*, *Minds* and *Beings*, having each of them his *own* Understanding, and all other *Personal* Qualifications. It is indeed apparent *Tritheism*; and that was the true Reason, why the Schools advanced a *new* Explication: but because *the Schools* durst not find fault with *the Fathers*, or seem to depart from their Doctrine; therefore what the Fathers intended of one *Specifick* Essence, or Nature, or Substance, *that* the Schools interpreted of one *Numerical* Substance, Nature or Essence; but of that hereafter, when we examine their Doctrine in its own place.

Dr. *Cudworth* being a great a Philosopher, as every one knows he was, found himself very hard put to it, what to say (*ὁμοουσιον* and *ὁμοουσιον*) concerning the Persons of the Trinity. He saw, that either he must say, that they are but one *self-same* Essence or Substance, in Number; or that they have *distinct* and *several* Substances or Essences. To say, that they are (or they must in) one *self-same* Substance or Essence *in Number*, is such *Jargon* in Philosophy, that it is to say, in the Nature and Possibilities of Things, that he never speaks of it, without a just mark of Contempt: 'tis Nonsense, saith he, and 'tis impossible; and besides that, 'tis *Sabellianism*, and a Trinity not of *Persons*, but of *Words* and *Names*.

With what shall we say then, that the three Persons are *three* distinct Substances; is it not plain *Tritheism*? No, says the Doctor, for the Persons are *the equal*, the Father is both *the Principle* or Original, and *the Head* of the other two Persons; and besides that, he only is Omnipotent *in sum*. But then, will some say, indeed this Explication saveth us but *one* God, which is the thing we look after; but it is by utterly abolishing the Godhead of the Son and Spirit; it maketh only the Father to be *really* God, the other two Persons are so only by a certain *Dependence* on him, both in Origination and Acting. A base as this Consequence is, and as clear, Dr. *Cudworth* is forced to swallow it, and to sit down contented with it: he thought, it should seem, it is better somewhat to trifle the use of *Words*, than the Nature and Possibilities of *Things*. 'Tis hard indeed, that we must say, one *Supreme* and two *Dependent* Persons make but one God; but 'tis harder to say, three Persons have but one Substance or Essence, in *Number*. Words are *Arbitrary* Signs, applied to things according as men please; and therefore are capable of Alteration in their use; but the Nature of Things is absolutely unchangeable; *three* Persons can *never* be *one* Substance, Essence or *Individual* Nature. No Philosophy, but that of *Gotham*, will allow; that one Intelligent Substance

can

can be more than one Person; but divers Philosophers, especially the Platonists, have called three Distinct, Intelligent, Substances; one *Deity*, or God; therefore nothing hinders, but that we also may Christians. To this purpose *Dr. Cudworth*, in divers places of his *Intellectual System*, [illegible]

But it is now time, to make our Observations on this Doctor's Explication; which shall be the more carefully, because I am assured that all the other *Fathers* were in his Sentiments, that the three *Divine Persons* are *three* distinct individual *Substances* or *Essences in Number*; which by *the Schools* and all the Moderns, is granted to be *Trinitas*; and because it is evident by his *Intellectual System*, that this Doctor understood all the Philosophies, Ancient and Modern, in the [illegible] Ways; and was himself one of the [illegible] Philosophers we have known. This Explication hath these Parts: 1. [illegible] Persons are (one *Substance*, [illegible]) three distinct, particular *individual Substances* or Essences in Number, or in the *Reality* of Things; and that for, or in the *Reality* of Things; and that otherwise, there could not be three Divine Persons, but only [illegible] That three distinct, individual, [illegible] Divine Essences, or Substances, commonly called *Persons*, are yet but one God, because tho they are *three* in Number, yet they are *one* in *Origin*; or the Idea, and Reasons are derived from the Nature, as there Fountain and Cause. 2. That they are three Persons, yet they are but one Person, because they concur in all the same Actions both of Creation and Providence, and in *Them*, even the Effect. The Emphasis of this lies in their concurring to all the same Actions; but principally in this, that they concur to the same Actions, *and as they were it the Author*.

2. That the Divine Persons are three distinct, particular, *individual*, *Intelligent* Substances, Essences or Natures; and that otherways, that is, were there but one *Individual* Substance, or Essence in *Number*, they should not be *three Persons*, but only *one* Person. I have granted, that if there *were* three Divine Persons; those Persons are (of necessity) *three* distinct, individual Essences or Substances; so that, as to this full Proposition, the Doctor and the Socinians are perfectly agreed; all that we deny, is, that there then Essences (or Persons) are, or *can* be but one God.

But tho the Socinians allow, that *three Persons* must be three distinct *Substances* or Essences, yet all the *Modern* Unitarians utterly deny it: the reason is, because they saw plainly, that to say, there are *three* distinct Essences, or Substances, is to grant (in effect) to the Socinians, that they so much contend for; namely, that the Doctrine of the Trinity doth imply three Gods. Three distinct Divine *Persons*, then Dr. Cudworth, are three distinct Divine *Essences* or *Substances*; it is true, say the Socinians, and we grant this to the Doctor, but say the *Modern* Unitarians, *three* distinct Divine *Essences*, are not only three distinct Divine *Persons*, but they are also three distinct *Gods*; if once we grant that the three Divine *Persons* are three *Essences*, the Socinians will extract it from us (as an unavoidable Consequence) that we owned three Gods.

The truth is, that the Lincoln Council, which was assembled in favour of the Doctor against *Dr. Sherlock*, but the Fathers, that there is but one only Divine Essence, or Substance or Nature; I do believe, there hath been any Divine of note, but Dr. *Cudworth* and Dr. *Sherlock*, and some few, who may have borrowed it from them, who durst ever publish it in Writing, that there are three distinct Divine *Substances*, Essences or Natures, or that *were distinct* [illegible] *Substance*. They all say, that to do so, is to introduce three Gods; for if you say, there are *three* distinct Intelligent, Almighty, All-knowing and Pre-eternal Substances, Essences or Natures; you have already said, there are three Gods, *having the two other* [illegible] *fallen in their Description of three Gods*. For One All-knowing, Almighty Essence or Substance, is one perfect God, to whom nothing at all can be added; 'tis no better than folly, or *phrenzy*, to deny, that *three* such Essences or Substances are *three* Gods.

This

This plain and clear Reason hath constrained the School-Divines to depart from the Explication of the Fathers, and rather oblige all the Moderns, to follow the Schools, and forsake the Fathers. Yet so, as out of good Manners, to deny that the Fathers ever held more than one Divine Essence or Substance: but I have shown before, the Ground of that gross (and I doubt not, wilful) Mistake, of the Doctrine of the Fathers. But Dr. *Cudworth* thought, that he had found an Expedient, how he might keep firmly to the Fathers, and yet not be guilty of Tritheism: for, saith he, tho there are three distinct Divine Essences or Substances, vulgarly called Persons; yet the second and third Persons or Essences are *derived* from the first; and they all concur to the same Actions, under the same Head or Principal, even the Father. Therefore,

5. To this, the second and third Persons are *derived* from the Father, as their Fountain and Cause; therefore they may be reckoned as one God with him: Here begins the Controversy, between the Socinians and the Doctor. They hold, that every distinct Person is a distinct and particular Spirit or Substance; but they deny, that two distinct Spirits or Substances can be understood to be one God. Unity of Original, or that the second and third Persons are derived from the first, will not help the Doctor, no not in the least. The three Divine Essences (which are called Persons) are one God, saith this Doctor, because the second and third are *derived* from the first. Why doth he not say too, that three *Human* Essences (or Persons) whereof the second and third derive themselves from the first, are one *Man*? He may as well say this, and as soon persuade it, as the former: the Son and Grandchild *derive* themselves from a first Human Essence (or Person) called the Grandfather; two Brothers derive themselves from their common Father. Doth this Unity of Original make them all to be but one *Man*? If not, neither can Unity of Original make the Son and Spirit one God, with their Fountain and Cause, even the Father. It is a [illegible] [illegible] of Dr. *Cudworth*, the Son and Spirit are particular Substances or Essences, derived from the Essence of the Father, as their Principle or Cause, therefore they are one God with the Father: for thus, all Angels, all Men, nay, and all Beasts, shall be one God with the Father, who is their Cause and Principle. Unity of Original is so far from proving, that they are one God with him; that it even *demonstrates* the very contrary: for if they are derived from the one true God, they themselves cannot be that one true God, no more than the *Effect* can be the Cause, that very Cause whose Effect it is.

These Arguments are so clear, and withal so very obvious; that I wonder much, that Dr. *Cudworth* foresaw them not: but it may be he foresaw them; he thought withal that even all these Consequences are better, than to admit such a Monstrosity in Philosophy, as three Persons having only one single Substance in Number. All things, how hard soever, would go down with him, but only this; but this can never be agreed to, by a Philosopher.

6. His last Reasoning was this; the three Divine Essences (called *Persons*) are but one God, because they concur to all the same Actions, of Creation and Providence, under one Head the Father, who only is Almighty of *himself*, or really Almighty. How many *Paradoxes* hath he found us, in a very little compass? 1. There is one Almighty, who together with two other Persons, is one God. I would know, how two other Persons can contribute to make him a perfect God, who without them is *Almighty*? The Scale is already full, if *Almighty* be there; we need no more Weight: and least of all, the Weight of two *Impotents*. If the Son and Spirit are not *Almighty of them*[selves], or not *really* Almighty, but only as the Father *Omnipotently* concurs with them; they are *Impotents*: for every Person and Thing, that is not Almighty, or cannot do *all* things, is impotent to *some* things.

Dr. Cudworth, indeed, for a number in Philosophy, has evidently shewed, that those *Almighty* Persons are (of necessity) other Gods; therefore he will admit of but one Almighty Person, even the Father. But then, he should have look'd a little further, or elsewhere; and he would also have seen, that when he had found an *Almighty*, there was no need to add to him, an *Independent*, to make him a compleat God. For (as he speaks) to make up the Intimacy of the Division, and This alone, that it is, strange and surprising; that the Son and Spirit are one God with the Father, because *they are gathered under him, as their Head and Principal*. Doth not the Doctor *prevaricate*? doth he not say these things, only to establish *Unitarianism*, so much the more strongly? For if you say *first*, that the Father is the *Head* and *Principal*, and the Son and Spirit are subjected to him; and *then*, therefore they are one God with the Father their Principal and Head: this, in a Man of so great Sense, looks like meer Prevarication; for 'tis plain to *all*, that he should have inferred the contrary, namely, *therefore only the Father is God*. We shall see the Weakness of Dr. *Cudworth's* Reasoning, so soon as ever we apply it to any other Instances. The Son and Spirit are one God with the Father, saith he, because he is their Head and Principal: therefore say I, the Servants and their Master, the Subjects and their Prince, the Children and their Parents, are all one *Governor*, because the Subjects, Servants, and Children, are gathered under their Prince, their Master and Parent, as their Principal and Head. Will the Doctor allow of this (*bad*) Consequence; if not, he vainly urges, or insists on the other. But the Son and Spirit concur with the Father, to all the same Actions, both of Creation and Providence; and therefore, may be said to be one God with him.

If the Doctor could prove, that the Son and Spirit concur to the same Acts, of Providence and Creation, with the Father; he would *thereby* prove, that there are *three* Gods, not that the concurring Persons are *one* God. Many Carpenters, for instance, concur to make a Ship, under one Head as Principal, the *Master Builder*. Many Colonels and Captains muster to the Dwelling of an Army under one Principal and Head, their *General*. Are therefore all these Carpenters, Colonels and Captains, one *Master Builder*, and one *General*? Then there is but one Master Builder, and but one General, we grant; but the Captains and Carpenters, concurring with their Master Builder, and General, are not one with the General and Master Builder.

I do not think it necessary to make any further Reflections, on such impotent Reasonings: I will leave it with you, Sir, to judge, Whether Dr. *Cudworth* hath given any new Strength to the Trinitarian Cause, by reviving an old *sophistic* Explication.

If we will give a Name to Dr. *Cudworth's* Explication of the Trinity, we must call it *mollis Arianismus*, *A moderate Arianism*. The Arians were divided into two Parties, the high or *rigid* Arians, and the *Ariani Mollis*, or the moderate Arians. The former of these (being the Eunomians and *Aetians*) strictly followed *Arius*; they believed, that the Son was created by the Father, or God, but a little before the Creation of the World; and that the Spirit was the Work or Creature of the Son and Father. The other Substances or Essences were also created, but from eternity. But the moderate Arians were content to say, that there was no *sensible* Division of Time, between the Being of God the Father, and the *Generation* or *Creation* (for those are with them equivalent Terms) of the Son; the Father *made* or generated the Son, so early, that there was no *sensible* Portion of Time before the Son was; no more than was absolutely necessary, for giving to the Father the *Priority* of Dignity, and his Title of *Father*: and as to their *Substances*, they are *Consubstantial*; by which the Sect of Arians meant, (And the Church has meant no more) that their Substances or Essences are *alike*, or *the same* for Kind and Properties, tho not in Number; that is, the Essences of these three Persons are all of them Spiritual, Eternal

Eternal and Infinite, tho only the Father is Infinite in *Power*. These *moderate* Arians were brought to Conformity by this and some Tolerations, and particularly by Pope *Liberius*, who, *Baronius* publishes, thinks very Favourably of them, he allowing only the Father to be *Consubstantial*, and this he faith, that the Son and Spirit are also *Eternal*; yet the common Heresy, that there must be some *Priority* of the Father, as the Fountain, Principle and Cause, he ascribes to the Son and Spirit as *Effects*. In a word, the *moderate* Arians also had as much to his Son as *Dr. Sherlock* does to his. Were Dr. *Cudworth* alive, it would not be expedient to make this Judgment of his Explications; but being dead, it cannot hurt him. He is retired to the true *Mount Ararat*, or *Land of Mysteries*, where he no longer *guesses*, by prudent and wary Conjectures, but he knows and even sees how these things are. God and Nature, after which he *aspired* with so much Application and Freedom, are now *Kind* to him; and he now reads from his excellent Labours, out of all danger from the Malevolence of the present evil Generation, (with whom it is Calumny not to take every thing upon Trust, tho the most Credulous of Men, tho in their Believing.) As it is enough to stumble, not to inquire, but to adhere, not to examine, try and judge, but to *presuppose* and take for granted every thing that has been sold us by Men in Power and Place. This is the Spirit that now prevails in the Church, and on the contrary, an ingenuous *Freedom* in enquiring and examining, also is, but nothing else indeed but an honest and necessary Disposition, now called *Heresy* and *Schism*; and, if you believe them, to be punished with certain Damnation. We have hopes, in the mean time, that Satisfaction; that it is God, who shall at last judge us; He shall bring to light all things, *hidden* and which are in Darkness, and make the Counsels of Men manifest, according to *Aristotle*, defended by Dr. *Bentley*.

Of the Exposition by Dr. S——h.

I have already done Right to Dr. *Sherlock*, and his Book; if he takes it amiss, that I observe also some Defects in it, he ought to shew his *Patience*, by which he is confessed the only *Adversary* on the Book of others.

If he hath received any *Pretended* Wrong, or Affront from Dr. *Sherlock*, he is the more excusable, that his Book hath so much more *Scurrility*, than *Argument*; but the Injury must have been very great, to excuse him wholly. He has noted some Errors, either of Inadvertency and Haste, or of the Pen, in some Expressions and Words used by Dr. *Sherlock*: he imputes all these, as faults of meer Ignorance or Dulness to the Doctor. This was somewhat harborous; nay it was more *Barbarous* in Points of Morality or Manners, than even Dr. *Sherlock* was guilty of, in Grammar or Speech. Dr. *S*——*n* hath said any thing against it, which Dr. *Sherlock* will much value.

The Arguments alled by Dr. [illegible], are only *two* [illegible] Scriptures easily [illegible] and easily [illegible] Law. [illegible] Explicatory [illegible] reckoned [illegible] ran Council: but Dr. [illegible] to be [illegible] Mystery, and therefore advised to propose [illegible] such his Hand, to save the [illegible] and [illegible] made an [illegible] Paul. [illegible] will pass from the [illegible] Dogmatical Doctrine to his Book and Explication [illegible] Chap. 8. that he begins to [illegible] with the Catholick and Orthodox Accounts of his *Trinity* [illegible] *Unity*, but at length, in *Page* [illegible] comes to *Scripture*, with this Preface to [illegible] The Doctrine of the Church, and of the Apostles, concerning the Blessed Trinity, so far as I can judge, but still with [illegible] *Judgment* of the Church of England in the Case is this. Truly, I am heartily sorry to hear, that Dr. [illegible] at these Years, has no *fixed* Religion of his own, no for concerning the Trinity it self, but is ready to run with the Wind; is prepared to receive any Doctrine and Explication, which he believes to be not only *Orthodox*, but *Fundamental* in the Church commended him. Mr. *Wilson* makes the same Compliment, to his good Mother the Church, in his late Book against the Socinians; as I have noted in my Answer to them: but Mr. *Atterbury* is somewhat excusable, because he is indeed yet preferred any of the Rewards, due to his Industry and Learning; that Dr. [illegible] is full, and even overflows with the Blessings of the holy Mother; to should from Dr. [illegible] thinkest, he has say yet [illegible] he would never be so *vain-glorious*, as to put his Faith to sell *upon*, and that too under the *hand of Subscription*, at the Command of his Reverend Mother. We may infer however, from these *pitied* Professions of the Writers, that could the Socinians get Mother Church of their side, all her Champions would also come over to us: for is not (it seems) the *Cause*, that they defend; is not the Trinity or Incarnation, that they make; but our Mother, our Heavenly the *two* [illegible] Children, [illegible] to make to Light of his [illegible] Explication, that he is ready to [illegible] it [illegible] as the [illegible] Mother Church shall [illegible] the Doctrine [illegible] will look on both sides of it, will [illegible] in clear Light; before they bargain for it. Well, say here it is: The [illegible] by which the Godhead Three diversified into [illegible] are called the [illegible] Persons. Therefore for understanding the Mystery of the Trinity, we must declare, what is properly understood (or Manner) of Being in Godhead, nor in Godhead, where two [illegible] indeed the adequate Division of *Real Being*, but [illegible] is properly a certain *Habitude* of some *Being*, *Quale*, or Thing, whereby the said Being or Being determined to some particular State or Condition, which, barely of it self, it should not have been determined to. And according to this Account, a Mode in things *Spiritual* and *Immaterial* hath the like Reference to such Beings, as a *Figure* hath to Bodies, to which it gives some Difference or Distinction, without superadding any new *Entity* or *Being* to it. In a word, a Mode is not properly a *Being*, whether *Substance* or *Accident*, but a certain superadding or cleaving to Being, and ascertaining it, from its *Matter*, *Form*, and *Infinitude*, to something more particular, as we have just now examined it. As for instance, *Dominion* is a Mode, determining the general Nature of Being to the particular State and Condition, by virtue of which it *pertains to him*, and is *appointed by another*; and the like may be said of Mutability, Presence, Absence, Inherence, Adherence, and such like, [illegible] they are not Beings, but Modes or Affections of Being; and inseparable from it so far, that *they have no Existence of their own*, after a Separation or Division from the Things, or Beings to which they belong. *Alexander*. p. 230, 241, 242.

Behold

Behold the Birth of the Mountains! We are kept in ſuſpenſe ſeveral long Chapters; at length [illegible] of this Book, he brings forth this Oracle. That the three Divine Perſons ſo much talk'd of, are neither Subſtances, nor Accidents, and conſequently, ſaith he, not Real Beings. Nay, they have no real Exiſtence of their own; but are Modes, Habitudes, or Affections of the Divine Subſtance, or the Subſtance of God: they are in the Godhead, or in the Subſtance of God, ſuch as Mutability, Preſence, Abſence, Inherence, Adherence, and ſuch like, are in the Natures, or Subſtances to which they belong. Or if you will have a great deal in one ſingle word, for very Iliads in a Nut-ſhell, they are Poſtures: or what amounts to the ſame thing, they are ſuch in Spiritual and Immaterial Beings, that a Poſture is in a Body.

I muſt needs here tell you, Sir, the Story of the Princeſs Dulcinea del Toboſo, Miſtreſs to the Renowned Don Quixot, of the Mancha in Spain. This famous Princeſs had the Honour to be Miſtreſs of the Affections of the ſo much celebrated Don Quixot; for her, he traverſed Mountains, Deſerts, and other dreadful Places; for her he encountered Giants, Enchanters, and other formidable Dangers; and at length for her, to ſatisfy his amorous Paſſions towards her, he retired to a place called the poor Rock; where he ſpent much time in lamenting the Diſdains, the Cruelty and Hard-heartedneſs of his Miſtreſs towards himſelf, as is largely related in the Hiſtory. Don Quixot was waited on in his long Travels and Adventures by his Eſquire Sancho Pancha, who greatly pitied his Maſter, that he ſhould ſerve ſo rigorous a Miſtreſs: but the Eſquire had one Scruple in his Mind, Who this Dulcinea del Toboſo ſhould be? But while Don Quixot was tormenting himſelf, at the poor Rock; he unluckily happened to drop ſome words, by which it evidently appeared, that Dulcinea del Toboſo was only an imaginary Lady or Princeſs; and that indeed ſhe was no other Perſon, but a certain coarſe Country Wench, Daughter of the Farmer Alonſo Xaucho, and for her Plainneſs called Joan. Ta, Ta, cries Sancho Pancha, is this the Princeſs Dulcinea? [illegible] Joan Xaucho! [illegible] a ſturdy Queen, well may ye [illegible] for her; for I am well perſwaded ſhe hath no [illegible] of Law-matters; but it is a good handſome Wench, &c.

Methinks, Sir, there can be nothing more apt, or proper for this place, than this Story. For juſt ſuch a Diſappointment do we all meet with, in the Explication Sir which Dr. S—— hath made us wait ſo long, as Sancho Pancha had when he found the Princeſs Dulcinea was Joan Xaucho! Dr. S——th had raiſed the Expectation of his Readers, in no fewer than three Preliminary Chapters; in the eighth he promiſes in the Title of it, the long-look'd-for, the much-deſired, Catholick, and Orthodox Explication of a Trinity of Divine Perſons, in the Unity of the Godhead: but when all comes to all, how [illegible] the three Divine Perſons are nothing elſe but the Subſtance of God, or the Godhead, [illegible] three Poſtures. Never were Men ſo baulk'd before as his Readers are, at this News, that the Princeſs Dulcinea turned into Joan Xaucho!

Was it worth while, to fall upon Dr. Sherlock in that outrageous manner, only becauſe he would make of the three Divine Perſons, three Reſpects of the Godhead, or the Subſtance of God in three Reſpects? Dr. Sherlock, poor, ſenſeleſs, illiterate Gentleman, Ignoramus, thought, that theſe words Father, Son and Spirit implied ſomething that was real. He imagin'd, that the Notion which all Men naturally have of a Father, his Son, and a Spirit diſtinct from both, muſt be filled up with ſomething that will honeſtly and ſubſtantially anſwer to ſuch Names and natural Notions of a Father, a Son, and a Spirit diverſe from both: therefore, ſaith he, ſeeing theſe Perſons are Spiritual, and Immaterial, and Intelligent; I call them three Minds, three Spirits, and three Beings. But the Adepts of Oxford will make him know his Miſtakes; Firſt, Dr. Wallis tells him, Three Perſons and one God, is as much as to ſay, three Reſpects of one God to his Creatures; he is their Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier, and in this ſenſe is called three

Persons, tho he is indeed but *one God*, and but *one Being*; but Dr. *S—th* answers, 'tis neither so nor so; *three Divine Persons are the Substance of God in three Postures*, or *Postures*. *Or*, in three such *Modes* as *Souls*, which have the same or like Reference to *Bodies*, Spiritual and Immaterial, that *Postures* have to *Bodies*. The three *Personalities* are *Modes* in the One Substance of God, which Mutability, Presence, Absence, Inherence, Adherence, and such like (*Accidents*) Affections and Habitudes are in the Substances to which they belong. He thinks, it should seem, that the Faithful must *partake Truth* in these *Postures*, and *mutable* Mutability, Presence, Absence, or something which in Spirituals is *like to them*; something which is no more in the Deity, than Postures are in Bodies. If they, Dr. *Sherlock* will object to him, that *Mode* of the Nature of a meer Habitude or Modality, to be *changeable*, and that the Personalities in the Divine Nature (as God) are *unalterable* or *unchangeable*. He will say too, it may be, that there is no meer Modality but may be away from the Nature, or Substance to which it belongs; without *any change to the Essential Perfections* of such Nature or Substance; but you cannot take away the Personalities of the Persons, from the Substance of God, without lessening the Perfections of the Godhead. Therefore we must not say, that the three Divine Persons are only the Divine Substance with three *Modes*.

The three Divine Persons, he saith, are the one Substance of God diversified in three *Postures*. But how shall we conceive, that the Substance of God in the first Posture, or in Posture *A*, *begat* the same Substance of God (in Number) in Posture *B*? and how doth the third Posture, or Posture *C*, *proceed* (for under Pain of Damnation we must not say of this *third* Posture, how was it *begotten*) from the Substance of God considered in the Postures *A* and *B*? The Divine Substance, by they, in Posture *A*, or in the first *Mode*, *generated* the Divine Substance in the second Mode, or, as Dr. *S—th* speaks, in Posture *B*; and the self-same Divine Substance in the first and second *Modes breathed* (you must well mark *that*) the self-same Divine Substance in the third Mode, which is Posture *C*. Now that we understand such *Gibberish*, as that they pay as well as *Sense*, that to be *Omnipresent*, is necessary that one should renounce at once all good Sense, and content our selves for ever with a *Case* with our Sense.

The *Postures*, as distinguished from the Substance of God, are only *Personalities*; which is to say, three such *Modes*, as Posture, Mutability, and Dependence; such Dr. *S—th* says. They that hear this, will presently say, Dr. *S—th* and the Socinians are very near in an Agreement; we are like to have this *subtle*, *intricate* and *dangerous* Controversy fairly ended by the fare and particular Deservings of Dr. *S—th*. For he hath taught us, that all the Difference is indeed nothing; both Parties confess one self-same Substance, Essence of Godhead, only the *Orthodox* contend for *three Postures* in this Substance; and the *Socinians*, *therefore*, Socinians, hitherto, seem unwilling to allow of more than one *Mode* or Posture; but under the Instruction and Information of such a Teacher as Dr. *S—th*, they will return to the *full* Acknowledgment of the *Trinity*.

Dr. *Sherlock* had said, that there are some who make the three Divine *Persons* to be nothing else but three *Modes*; and he subjoyneth thereupon this Note, *Can any one think, that the Father begat only a Mode, and called it his Son?* Let us see now, how Dr. *S—th* rates him for this piece of Ignorance. "No, good Sir, that "none that I know of, is in danger of thinking or saying, 'tis no more than that *Socrates* begat only the *Shape* and *Figure* of a "Man, and then called it his *Son*; or (to "turn your own *blunt* Weapon against your "self) no more than God the Father begot "another *Self-consciousness*, and called it his "Son. *Animadv.* p. 201. And at p. 221, 222. and often elsewhere, he saith, *the Personalities*, by which the Deity stands *distinguished* into three distinct *Persons*, are by the generality of Divines, both *Antient* and *Modern*, called

[illegible] Dr. *Sherlock*? I would not grant to this *Dogma* whatever, the first Tenet of all the Scriptures for. It is certain there is today more common with the Antitrinitarians, who follow the School of Socinus, to call the three *Persons*, three *Modes*, and sometimes more barely, three *Modes* of the *Godhead*, or Divine Substance, or the Substance of God, [illegible] may well defend in this manner [illegible] the distinction of persons, and have they [illegible] to which they adhere to [illegible] are [illegible] true, which in all other Persons, [illegible] Persons [illegible] distinguish between the Persons and the Personalities: for [illegible] Properties peculiar to their [illegible] by which they are [illegible] distinguished from all other Persons of the same Divine Substance, [illegible] but the *Persons* of *Father*, *Son* and *Spirit*, besides their Modes and Properties, [illegible] also three *distinct* intelligent *Substances*, in which those Modes subsist. It is true, I say, that Human (and also *angelical*) Persons may be thus distinguished from their *Personalities*; but as otherwise in the three Divine Persons, the three Divine *Persons* are properly and truly called *three Modes*, the meaning is, it is supposed by the Modalists, there is the Godhead the three Persons have all *the self same*, individual Substance or Essence in Number, and that they have also but one *self same* Understanding, Will and Energy (or Power or Action) in Number, contrary to what happens in all other Persons, whether *Human* or *Angelical*, who all have *distinct* Substances, *distinct* Understandings, Wills and Energies, first and second Mode, Branch (you must well remark that) the self-same Divine Substance in [illegible] Mode, without [illegible] [illegible] with all the Attributes [illegible] and [illegible] following, the *Personalities* in the Godhead (not the *Persons*) are three Modes, Affections, or Attributes, of the Divine Substance, Nature, or Essence.

Now here I Dr. *Sherlock*, I would not grant to this *Dogma* whatever, the first Tenet of all the Scriptures for. It is certain there is today more common with the Antitrinitarians, who follow the School of Socinus, to call the three *Persons*, three *Modes*, and sometimes more barely, three *Modes* of the *Godhead*, or Divine Substance, or the Substance of God, [illegible] may well defend in this manner [illegible] the distinction of persons, and have they [illegible] to which they adhere to [illegible] are [illegible] true, which in all other Persons, [illegible] Persons [illegible] distinguish between the Persons and the *Personalities*: for [illegible] Properties peculiar to their [illegible] by which they are [illegible] distinguished from all other Persons of the same Divine Substance, [illegible] but the *Persons* of *Father*, *Son* and *Spirit*, besides their Modes and Properties, [illegible] also three *distinct* intelligent *Substances*, in which those Modes subsist. It is true, I say, that Human (and also *angelical*) Persons may be thus distinguished from their *Personalities*; but as otherwise in the three Divine Persons, the three Divine *Persons* are properly and truly called *three Modes*, the meaning is, it is supposed by the Modalists, there is the Godhead the three Persons have all *the self same*, individual Substance or Essence in Number, and that they have also but one *self same* Understanding, Will and Energy (or Power or Action) in Number, contrary to what happens in all other Persons, whether *Human* or *Angelical*, who all have *distinct* Substances, *distinct* Understandings, Wills and Energies,

Further, who he is indeed but are God, and but [illegible] Dr. S—th answers, 'tis neither [illegible] [illegible] as well as *self* in Person, which being [illegible] the same *Mode* or *Personality* [illegible] in the Godhead, [illegible] distinguished in their *distinct* Substances, their [illegible] several Understandings, Wills and Energies [illegible] as well as by their peculiar Modes and Properties; but in the Godhead there is no such distinction, it has one *self same* Substance, Understanding, Will and Energy in its [illegible] distinguished by its *Modes*, and those *Modes* are distinguished from one another by themselves only. But by Dr. *Sherlock* they say, that all the Modalists acknowledge not other distinction between the three Divine Persons, than it consists [illegible] distinguished by their *Modes*, not by particular *Distinct* Modes, [illegible] [illegible] Modes (that is, for the Creation [illegible] Book of Creation, [illegible] [illegible] Persons, [illegible] this of [illegible] which he imputes to the Modalists, and which Dr. S—th so much abhors, the three [illegible] *Mode* of God, and then [illegible] Substance, [illegible] the three Divine Persons are the three Modes of God, distinguished by three Modes of Subsistence. [illegible] Dr. S—th [illegible] Modes, [illegible] the Father, [illegible] the *Personalities* of the Father, Son and Spirit, by *Modes*; *Justin* and *Irenæus* have called them *ἀρχαὶ*, *Modes of subsisting*; others call them *Properties*, but by books, Properties, Characters, and such like, the Fathers meant quite another thing, than Dr. S—th and the Moderns do; they meant what Dr. *Sherlock* and Dr. *Cudworth* mean.

By

By a *Mode* and *Property* they meant [illegible] *diſcriminating Character*, by which the Individuals of any *Specifick* Nature are diſtinguiſhed or differenced, from all the Individuals of the ſame Species or Nature. For Example, the Individuals of the *Specifick* Nature of *Humanity*, are particular *Men*; and all ſuch Individuals or particular *Men* are diſtinguiſhed, characterized, differenced or modified, each by his particular *Properties*; *Peter* from *John*, *Peter* and *John* from *James*, by particular Properties, Characters or Modes, both of Body and Mind; one (for inſtance) is *bigger*, *taller*, *wiſer*, or ſome other the like, than the other. This was what they meant, when they deſcribed *Perſonalities* by *Modes*, and when they ſaid there were three Properties, Modes, or Characters in God: they meant not in the leaſt to deny, that each Perſon is a *particular* Subſtance, Eſſence or Nature, different in Number from all other Subſtances, Eſſences or Natures; or to deny, that each Perſon is a particular *Being*: they meant only, that each Individual, or each Perſon, beſides the common Specifick Nature, (that is, beſides the ſame *Human*, *Angelical* or *Divine* Nature) has alſo ſome particular Properties or Characters; which diſtinctly diſtinguiſh him, from all the Individuals or Perſons of the ſame *Species*, Specifick Nature, or Kind.

It is not true therefore, what Dr. *S—th* pretends, that by *Modes* of *Subſiſtence* the Ancients meant no more, than certain ſuch Habitudes or *Affections*, as Mutability, Preſence, Abſence, Poſture, or ſuch like: they meant *real*, *diſtinctive* and *characterizing* Properties or Qualifications; and by *Perſon* they meant, a particular, individual, intelligent Subſtance or Eſſence, and ſo modified or characterized. They were far from *dreaming*, that the three Divine Perſons, an Almighty Son, an Almighty Father, and an Almighty Spirit diſtinct in Number from both, were only one individual Subſtance diſtinguiſhed, or diverſified by only three ſuch *lank* and *meagre* Affections, as *Abſence*, *Poſture*, *Adherence*; or any other that are no more in a *Spiritual* *Subſtance*, than [illegible] there are in Bodies, to which they adhere, [illegible], and from which they are (every moment) ſeparable. [illegible] what becomes of the Diſpute about *Perſons* and *Perſonalities* in God; whether they are *ſpecifically the ſame* [illegible]; and again, whether the *Modern* [illegible] *in the Schools*, agree with the *Ancients* in their *Notion of them*: for I will put to Dr. *S—th* a plain Queſtion, to which if he is diſpoſed to give a clear and Categorical Anſwer, it will appear to all Men, that either he falls in with Dr. *Sherlock*, or with the Unitarians; that is to ſay, he is either a Tritheiſt, or (what, I doubt, he will as much abhor) a *Socinian*.

He ſaith, there is *but* one only Divine Subſtance, Eſſence or Nature; and thus far we agree with him: but he adds, this one Subſtance is ſo diverſified by three *Modes*, *Affections* or Habitudes, or ſomething like to them, that we muſt (under pain of *Hereſy* and Damnation) ſay this one Subſtance is three Divine Perſons, a *Father*, his *Son*, and a *Spirit* diſtinct from both. Therefore I aſk, have the three (pretended) Divine Perſons, each his own proper, peculiar and perſonal Underſtanding, Will and Energy; ſo that there are in the Divine Subſtance, or in God, three diſtinct (all-knowing, almighty) *Underſtandings*, *Wills* and *Energies*, as there are three diſtinct *Perſons*, as Dr. *Sherlock* has aſſerted? Or have the three Perſons but one only *ſelf-ſame* Underſtanding, Will and Energy in Number, as there is but one *ſelf-ſame* Subſtance in Number? If he ſaith the former, he joins Hands with Dr. *Sherlock*; and is guilty of *Tritheiſm*, no leſs than he: for three (Omniſcient and Omnipotent) Underſtandings, Wills and Energies, without doubt, are three Gods. If there be three *Omniſciencies* and *Omnipotencies*, of neceſſity there muſt be three *Omniſcients* and *Omnipotents*: but that is Tritheiſm, even in the Judgment of *Athanaſius* himſelf; who expreſly denies *three Almighties*, or three All-knowings. And indeed I do not think, Dr. *S—th* will ſay, that each Perſon hath his own proper and perſonal Underſtanding,

ſtanding,

standing, Will or Energy; so that there are three distinct Understandings, Wills and Energies in what his Party call the *Godhead*: I see his Book is written with more Judgment and Precaution, than Dr. *Sherlock*'s; or even than any that I have seen, that have been written in Defence of the Trinitarian Cause. But if he denies, that there are three (All-knowing, Almighty) Understandings, Wills and Energies; he is a Socinian, he has granted to us the Point in Controversy, he grants the whole that we contend for. They will allow him to say, there are *three* Persons, or *three thousand* Persons in the Godhead; so long as he grants *but one* (Omnipotent) Energy and Will, and *but one* (All-knowing) Understanding or Wisdom. If this be granted to us, 'tis plain to every one who gives but never so little heed; that the Question about *three Persons*, is a meer Strife of *Words*; and the Authors of the *Brief History*, and *Brief Notes*, are (tho not in their Words, yet in their Senses) as Orthodox as Dr. *S—th* and the Schools. I will affirm, we have no need of our *Brief Histories* or *Brief Notes*; we need not make an operose Proof of our Doctrine of the Unity of God, from the Holy Scriptures or from Reason: the whole Controversy with the Church is ended, in the Resolution of this short and plain Question; Is there more than one *All-knowing, Almighty* Understanding, Will and Energy? If you say, there is but one such *Understanding, Will* and *Energy*, in one self-same Divine *Substance*; you may talk of as many Persons, Fathers, Sons, Spirits, Modes, Properties, Respects, *Nothings*, as you please: we will only peaceably advise you, that these are meer *empty* Words, that have nothing to answer them in the thing under Consideration. When you have granted to us, that there is but one Divine *Substance*, and but one Omniscient, Omnipotent *Understanding* and *Energy*; what you add more of Persons, Properties, *Thingums*, and call them a Trinity, 'tis an Addition only of *Words* and *Names*; not of Realities; or *Persons* that are properly so called.

These things being *so*, and so very *evident*; I cannot wonder, that so discerning a Philosopher as Dr. *Cudworth*, never speaks of the Trinity of the *Schools*, (maintained by Dr. *S—th*) without calling it a *Nominal* Trinity, a Trinity of *Names and Words* only, *a disguised Sabellianism*: which is to say, Unitarianism or Socinianism dress'd up in the absurd *Cant* of the *Schools*. But whereas the *Schools* deform the sincere and easy Notion of the Unity of God, as 'tis held by the Socinians and Sabellians, by transforming it into a *Fantastick* Trinity of *Nominal* Persons, or of Persons who are Persons only *in Name*, not in Truth and Reality: therefore Dr. *Cudworth* saith farther, that this Trinity is *Jargony in Philosophy, a Trinity that falls not under Human Conception, and which cannot be in Nature.* Intellect. System, p. 605. Elsewhere he scruples not to name it, *the Philosophy of Gotham*.

These are the just Characters which that great Philosopher and Divine gives of *the Scholastick* Trinity of Dr. *S—th*: he giveth his Reasons up and down in the *Intellectual System*; but 'tis not necessary for me to report them, when every one may see them in the Author himself; and besides they are too *Philosophical*, to be put into a Discourse which I design for the use of the less learned, as well as of the learned.

I have done with Dr. *S—th's Explication*, for this time: If he is angry with me for the Reflections I have made thereupon, I protest, 'tis without just Cause. I have used no disrespectful Language; I *have* acknowledged, and *do* acknowledge the *Worth* of the Man, and all other Perfections in his Book, but only this one, that *it* maintains an *unintelligible Explication*. The Method or Structure of his Book is Natural, Elegant and Judicious; the Words, Expression, or Phrase, is proper, forcible, clean, and well chose: it hath very many agreeable Turns of *Wit*, which render it pleasant to an ingenious Reader. As this Author hath a great deal of *Wit*, so he hath known how to govern it in this respect; that *he is witty, without Buffoonry*. This

is a Conduct, not very usual in those that have much Wit; commonly they know not how to manage it; and among other *injudicious* Neglects, they forget the *Where* and *When*, and other such like Circumstances; they are so taken with their Talent, as to be always using it, because they know not that *everlasting fooling is true and meer fooling*. But I wish that Dr. *S—th* in exercising his Wit, had remembred the *who*, which he hath utterly forgotten: and *that* was utterly an oversight, and a very great one. He cannot excuse himself, by pleading the many Contradictions in Dr. *Sherlock*'s Book; a candid Man would not impute them to the Author, but to the extream Obscurity of the Subject; when the Subject it self is contradictory, there will be many Contradictions committed in defending it. I doubt not that Dr. *Sherlock* will find many Contradictions in Dr. *S—th*'s second Chapter.

Having done to Dr. *S—th* this Right, he ought not to be out of Humour, that I, as a Socinian, have attacked his Explication; as I have some other Learned Mens: I mean no Disrespect thereby to him, or them; I acknowledge their *Personal* Merit, but cannot give up to them so sacred a Truth, as the Unity of God, or consent that it be *disguised* and *deformed*.

Of the Explication by Mr. Hooker, *Author of the Ecclesiastical Polity.*

MR. *Hooker*, tho he was none of the Fathers of the *Catholick* Church, is not of less Authority in the *particular* Church of *England*, than any one of the Fathers is: and it must be confest he was not only a very good, but a very learned and discerning Man. But it is observed of him, that in speaking of the Trinity, he speaks somewhat incorrectly: this was a Doctrine which he took for granted, there was no Dispute in his time about it; so he hath delivered himself, not with his usual Precaution and Judgment. He saith, "That "*the Substance* of God, with this Property, *to* "*be of none*, doth make the Person of the "Father. The very very *self-same* Substance "in Number, with this Property, *to be of the* "*Father*, maketh the Person of the Son. "The same Substance, having added to it "the Property of *proceeding from the other* "*two*, maketh the Person of the Holy Ghost. "So that in every *Person* there is implied "both *the Substance* of God, which is one; "and also that *Property*, which causeth the "same Person really and truly to differ from "the other two."

I must observe, in the first place, hereupon, that Mr. *Hooker* in this matter hath not spoken over critically and correctly; nay, hardly *Orthodoxly*: I mean, as Orthodoxy goes among the Learned of his own Party. He saith that *the Substance* of God, with these Properties, *to be of none*, to be *of the Father*, and to *proceed from the other two*, make *the Persons* of the Father, Son and Spirit: now to be *of none*, to be *of the Father*, and to *proceed from both*, are but other Words for this Sense, *to beget*, *to be begotten*, and *to proceed*. But that Father of *Modern* Orthodoxy, *Peter Lombard*, whom we have already twice mentioned, denies that these (before-mentioned) are Properties in *the Substance* of God, or that they *can* belong to it: he saith, *Essentia Divina non est generans nec generata, nec procedens*; i. e. *the Substance of God neither begets, nor is begotten, nor proceeds*. 'Tis impossible to make *this* consist with Mr. *Hooker*, who expresly ascribeth those Properties to the Divine Substance or Essence, and saith, that being in the Divine Substance, they make it to be three Persons.

What

What shall we do here? Shall we say, Reverend *Hooker* has mistaken, and misled his Sons (who are all the Church of *England*) into an Error concerning the Trinity? Hath he ascribed to the Divine Essence, *Properties*, which he calleth *Persons*, that are not in it? To give up *Hooker*, is to dishonour the Church of *England* it self; to part with Father *Hooker*, is to endanger the very *Surplice*, and even *the Cross* in Baptism; nay, *that Book of Books* the Common-Prayer. If Mr. *Hooker* could err about the Trinity; What will the *Fanaticks* and *Trimmers* say? Will they not be apt to pretend too, he may have erred in his profound Dissertations and Discourses for the *Rites* and *Discipline* of the *Church*?

I am afraid, for all that, we must keep close to *Peter Lombard*, Master of the Sentences, and of the *Modern* Divinity; he hath been espoused by all the Popes since *Innocent* the Third, by the *Lateran* Council which was *General*, and by the tacit Approbation of the whole Church ever since.

I doubt, it is not much more passible, that Mr. *Hooker* saith, that the Properties, *to be of none*, to be *of the Father*, and to *proceed*, do (together with the Substance of God) *make the Persons* of the Father, Son and Spirit. It is not true, that those are the Properties which *make the Persons*: he might say, that they make the Persons *to be Father, Son and Spirit*, or to have that threefold *Relation* among themselves; but they do not make the three Persons to be Persons; or thus, they do not make (as he speaks) *the Persons*. *To be of none* maketh *the Father*; but I deny, that it *maketh* (as Mr. *Hooker* affirms) *the Person* of the Father: the Character, or Property which maketh *the Person* of the Father, is quite another from the Property or Character that maketh *the Father*. To *beget*, to be *begotten*, and to *proceed*, are Properties which constitute *the Relations* of Father, Son and Spirit: but they are other Properties, which make *the Persons* of the Father, Son and Spirit.

Concerning the Properties or Characters which make *the Relations*, all *Learned* Trinitarians are agreed; they acknowledg them to be these *three*, *Active Generation* (not, as Mr. *Hooker* mistakes, this meer Negation *to be of none*) *Eternal Passive* Generation, or *to be begotten*, and *Eternal Procession*: but concerning the Properties that make *the Persons*, they are not so well accorded. The Antient Divines said, the Property that maketh *the Person* of the Father, or the peculiar Property and Character of *the first* Person, is *Monarchy*; the Property of *the second* Person, is *Wisdom*; and of *the third* is *Love*. Others said, that the Property of the first Person, is *Beatitude* and *Rest*; the Property of the second is *Operation*: others had still other Conceits, all of them false.

But allowing now the way of speaking, used by Mr. *Hooker*, what a *Riddle* has he propounded? Here is the *self-same* Substance (in Number) *unbegotten*, and yet *begotten*: the Divine Substance with the Property *to be of none*, or to be *unbegotten*, is (saith he) the Person of the Father; the self-same Substance (in Number) with the Property *to be of the Father*, or to be *begotten*, is (or makes) the Person of the Son. Can the self-same Substance (in Number) be *of none*, and yet be *of the Father*; be unbegotten, and begotten too? Are they not *contradictory* Terms, and therefore not to be applied to the self-same Substance in Number?

They will say, Mr. *Hooker* doth not affirm, that the self-same Substance is begotten and unbegotten; this indeed were a flat Contradiction; but he saith, that *as 'tis in the Father*, 'tis unbegotten; *as in the Son*, 'tis begotten.

But do they reckon they have to deal only with Fools? What if I should say, my Hand *as in my Pocket*, is unskalded; but *as in my Glove*, 'tis skalded: would it not be a Contradiction, for all the Binds of *in the Pocket*, and *in the Glove*? The *self-same* Hand in Number, cannot be *burnt*, and *unburnt*; the *Place* in which it is, will not palliate such a Contradiction; in like manner, the self-same Substance cannot be *begotten*, and *unbegotten*; because you are pleased to pretend, you consider

nder it sometimes in one Subject or Person, sometimes in another. In whatever Person a Substance is, it must either be a begotten Substance, or an unbegotten; it cannot possibly be *both*; if it really remains unbegotten, then it never was begotten; but if in process of time it has been begotten, then it cannot still be unbegotten.

Why do our Opposers choose to maintain such extravagant *Paradoxes*, rather than acknowledg so easy and natural a Truth, as the Unity of God? Rather than receive the first Commandment, in its natural and obvious sense; rather than we will sincerely (and without Disguise or Juggle) own that there is but one only God: we will choose to make our selves scorned by all sensible Men; by saying, the self-same Substance (in Number) is begotten, and *unbegotten*; 'tis of the Father, nay 'tis of Father and of Son, and yet *'tis of none*.

Let us consider Mr. *Hooker's Catch*, in three *Human* Persons. He will say, the Substance of *John* is begotten, *as* John *is the Son of* Peter; but *John's* Substance is unbegotten, *as* John *is the Father of* James: and yet it is the *self-same* Substance in Number, that is thus both begotten and unbegotten.

Is it so? but if *John's* Substance be really begotten, I will ever stand in it, that his Substance is not unbegotten; it was begotten by his Father *Peter*, therefore 'tis a begotten Substance, not an unbegotten.

Some one may say, but is not *John's* Substance unbegotten, *in respect of* John's *Son* James; tho it was begotten by *Peter*? By no means; for if *Peter* begot *John's* Substance, then *John's* Substance is begotten, tho his Son *James* begot it not; and consequently it cannot be said to be an unbegotten Substance, in any respect whatsoever.

In short, they would have us to say; *John's* Substance is unbegotten, because it was begotten by *Peter*, and not by *John's* Son *James*. I deny, that 'tis a proper, or a true way of speaking: for if the Substance has been begotten by any whomsoever; it must never after be called unbegotten, on this absurd account, that it was not begotten by *James*, but by *Peter*.

Farther, whereas Mr. *Hooker* saith, the Substance of God, with this Property *to be begotten*, or to be *of the Father*, maketh the Person of the Son: I ask, is then the Substance of God begotten; I pray, who begat it? They must answer, the Father? But did the Father beget the Substance of God? Do they not say, that the *self-same* Substance that is in the Father, is also in the Son? But if so, then if the Father begat the Substance of the Son, or of God, he begat his *own* Substance. Can any own beget his own Substance? Is it not a Contradiction, a manifold Contradiction? Is it not as much as to say, *he was before he was*? He that begets his own Substance, begets himself: but he that begets himself, is thereby supposed to have *been* before he *was*.

I know, it hath been said by some Divines, God is *self-originated* or *self-begotten*. But 'tis utterly false; they ought to have said, he is *unoriginated* or *unbegotten*. As God is not originated or begotten, *by another*; so much less *by himself*; not by another, for then that other must be before him, at least in order of Nature; not by himself, because then he must *be* before he *was*.

But to finish with Mr. *Hooker*, I will show his Followers, that in pursuance of his Explication, they will be forced to say; that as the Father *begat* the Son, so the Son *destroys* the Father. And I make challenge to them all, to rescue their Master's Explication from that fatal Consequence, *Begotten* doth always destroy *unbegotten*; when once a Person or Thing is *begotten*, that *self-same* Thing or Person can be no longer *unbegotten*. If therefore *the Substance* of God *unbegotten*, maketh (as Mr. *Hooker* contends) the Person of the Father; and the *self-same* Substance *begotten*, maketh the Person of the Son: it unavoidably follows, that *the Generation* of the Son is *the Destruction* of the Father; because the Property or Characteristick of the Father, even *unbegotten*, is destroyed out of the Divine Substance, by the Characteristick of the Son, which is *begotten*.

Unbe-

unbegotten (that is to say, *the Father*) remains no longer in the Divine Substance; if begotten (that is, according to *Hooker*, *the Son*) hath taken place in it.

O that our learned Opposers would vouchsafe, to consider these things impartially; that they would not reckon 'tis their Glory, to defend received Doctrines, only because they have been *long* received, and by *many*; as if *Prescription* or *Numbers* could alter the Nature of Truths and Untruths. Which (I pray) is more honourable, to own a clear and necessary Truth; or to set one's self to darken and to obstruct it? I confess the latter requires more Wit, especially against an able and dexterous Defendant; but 'tis the other that deserves greatest Praise, especially before God, because it argues *Sincerity* and *Justice*. But I pass to the last sort of Trinity, the *Mystical* Trinity.

Of the Mystical Trinity, or the Trinity of the Mobile.

THE poor common People are first made to believe, by the help of *corrupted* Copies, and *false* Translations of the Bible, that 'tis a Scripture-Doctrine; that there is *a Trinity* of Divine Persons, an Almighty *Father*, an Almighty *Son*, and an Almighty *Spirit* distinct and different (in Number) from both Father and Son. But because *this* (at the very first sight) appears contrary to Reason and common Sense; therefore in the *next* place they are told, that they must consider this Doctrine, as a *Mystery*, impossible indeed for us to *understand*, yet necessary to be *believed*, because God hath said it. How many things, say these Teachers, are there in the Works of Nature, which we understand not, no more than we can understand the Trinity; and yet we believe them to *be*, as assuredly; as if there were no Difficulty, in conceiving how they should *be*. As, that there are *Antipodes*, whose Feet are opposite to our Feet, and who walk with their Heads *downwards*, with respect to our Parts of the World. Again, that a *Spirit* can move a *Body* from place to place: tho *Reason first* assures us, that there can be no Motion without a *Resistance*; and *then*, that a pure Spirit can meet no Resistance, from *Matter* or Bodies. Also, that the Parts of Matter or Bodies hold together; tho no Cause can be assigned for it, but what appears immediately to be insufficient, nay ridiculous. All these are great Truths, and we believe them, even *contrary* to the Verdict of Reason: how much more ought we to believe the Trinity, which hath been propounded to us, as an Article of Faith, in the Word of God itself, tho our fallible and frail Reason reclaims, and kicks perhaps against it? When the Socinians, say these Gentlemen, have accounted for all the *Mysteries* of Nature and Art; let them begin to object to the Trinity, that 'tis a *Mystery*, and that it hath sundry *Contradictions to Reason*: but till they do the first, 'tis nothing else but a bold Impiety to insist on the other.

It must be confessed, Sir, that this is the most plausible Pretence; the strongest Hold, as well as the last Resort of our Opposers: when we have drove them from all other Posts, here they take Sanctuary. I will therefore take care to remove this Occasion, and Cover of Error. I say,

1. I might leave it wholly to Dr. *S—th*, to answer this Pretence of some of his Party. At *p.* 2, and 3, *&c.* of his *Animadversions*, he shows at large, what is a *Mystery*; he saith, that *a Mystery is a Truth revealed by God, above the reach of Human Reason to find out, or to comprehend*. He vindicateth this Definition, part by part; he saith, *p.* 3, first, *a Mystery is a Truth*; by which, saith he, I exclude every thing from being a Mystery, which is *absurd*, or *contradictious*. Now we desire nothing,

nothing else of our Opposers, but that they would abide by this Account of Mystery; that 'tis not something *absurd*, or *contradictory*, but only some Secret revealed by God, because it was above Human Capacity to discover it, and sometimes also even to comprehend how it can be. For there is a vast Difference between my not being able to conceive *how a thing should be*, and a clear Apprehension and Sight that *it cannot be*. There are (it may be) Mysteries, which we cannot comprehend how they should be: but that three *Divine* Persons, or three distinct *Almighty* and *All-knowing* Persons, should be but *one* Almighty, but *one* All-knowing, or but *one* God, a Man (who considers but with never so little Intention and Sincerity) clearly sees, that *it cannot be*. In short, that 'tis not a *Mystery*, but (as Dr. *S—th* speaks) an *Absurdity* and a *Contradiction*. In a word, we do not reject the Doctrines of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, because they are *Mysteries*; but because they are *plain Contradictions* to Reason and common Sense, and consequently *Untruths*: for (without doubt) Reason and Truth are but two Names, for the same thing; and *clear Reason is no other thing, but clear Truth*.

2. I consider, that what will *equally* serve to excuse all the Nonsense, and impossible Doctrines, that are to be found among Men; we cannot admit of it, as a Defence of the (pretended) Trinity and Incarnation: especially in Opposition to such powerful Proofs, both from Scripture and Reason; as may be, and actually are alledged against those Doctrines. A Papist, for Example, does (with equal colour) alledg this Pretence, for his *Transubstantiation*. He says, "'Tis a Scripture-"Doctrine, delivered in these express words, "*This is my Body*; and how many things are "there in the Works of Nature, which we "comprehend not, no more than we can "comprehend the Miracle of the *Transub-*"*stantiation*; and yet we believe them to *be*, as "assuredly, as if there were no Difficulty "in conceiving how they should be, or that "they can be. Such as the *Antipodes*; and "that a pure Spirit can *move* a Body, in "which it findeth no *Resistance*; and that "the Parts of Matter or Bodies are *continuous*, "or hold together: and many the like. Thus do the Papists argue; and I deny, that this Pretence can be wrested from them, by any Trinitarian: for 'tis the same Defence that the Trinitarian makes for his Doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. Our Opposers will not vouchsafe, so much as to hear Catholicks and Lutherans, when they plead *Mystery*, for the Transubstantiation or the Consubstanciation: I desire of them therefore, to give me but one Reason, why that Plea is not as good in those Controversies, as in these of the Trinity and Incarnation.

The Author of two *Dialogues*, concerning the Trinity and the Transubstantiation, finding himself pressed with this Difficulty, answers to this effect, that *there are a great many more Texts of Holy Scripture for the Trinity, than are pretended for the Transubstantiation*. But this is no Solution of the proposed Difficulty; for 'tis not at all the Question, which Doctrine hath most Texts alledged for it: but only, whether the Pretence of *Mystery*, be not a Plea as rational and allowable, against all the Exceptions made against the Transubstantiation, as an *impossible*, *inconceivable* and *contradictory* Doctrine; as 'tis to the *same* Exceptions, when urged by the Socinians against the Incarnation or Trinity? But whereas that Author insists upon an Answer, wholly foreign to this Difficulty; and is so careful to bring together, from Cardinal *Bellarmine*, all the Texts alledged for the Trinity: he is desired to name to us so much as one Text for either of those Doctrines; that is not given up to the Socinians, by some of the most Learned Interpreters and Criticks of his own Party, as indeed no Proof of the Trinity, the Incarnation, or the Divinity of the Son or Spirit. What avails it, for a Man to talk of the great number of Texts, which he can alledg; when the *ablest* Persons of his own Party, do (in the mean time) own the Unsufficiency of every one of them in particular? If he thinks he has cause to deny, that

that the Socinians have this great Advantage on their side; whenever he shall do it *publickly*, I will bear the Reproach, if I do not justify what I have said, by Citation of particular Authors of the first Note and Rank among our Opposers.

3. Our Opposers urge, that there are (and the Socinians themselves believe) a great many *Mysteries* in Nature; of which no Human Reason can give an Account, nay Reason *objects against them*, and professedly *contradicts them*; as that a pure Spirit can move a Body, in which it meets no *Resistance*; that Bodies or Matter consists of *indivisible* Parts; and such like. Well, suppose the Socinians should grant these, or other unaccountable Mysteries, which not only are not comprehended, but are *contradicted by Reason*: What then? Why, then they are very inconsiderate, to deny (as they do) the Trinity and Incarnation; on this account, that 'tis contrary to Reason, or implies Contradictions and Absurdities. But our Opposers should have thought better of this Objection, before they laid so great a Weight on it; even the Weight of their whole Cause. For tho we should grant, that we believe some Mysteries of Nature or Art, against which Reason objects, and many ways *contradicts them*; yet is this no Plea for the Trinity, or the Incarnation. For if we believe Natural or Artificial *Mysteries*, 'tis because we plainly see that so the thing is: we *see* or we *feel*, or have some other *undeniable* Proof of the thing; some such Proof, as no rational Man *will* or *can* refuse. Doth any Man believe *Mysteries*, or wonderful Tales, contrary to his Reason, and the Reason of all other Men; without a most *manifest* and *uncontestable* Proof of them; without some such Proof or Proofs, as *undeniably* evince the thing so to be? But will our Opposers pretend, they have any such Proofs for the Incarnation or Trinity; such *manifest*, such *evident*, such *uncontestable* Proofs, that no sober Man, or no reasonable Man can except against them, or refuse to admit of them? I do not think they will pretend to it, if it be but for this only Reason, because the Socinians are confest to be a Rational and Learned Party. Are those Evidences or Proofs *uncontestable*, which are rejected, not without some Scorn, by some of the learnedest, and most unsuspected of their own Party? Are they *uncontestable*, that not only may be *interpreted* to another Sense, but also are either otherways *read* in the best Copies of the Hebrew and Greek, or may be otherways *translated* from those Languages; and all this, by confession of the more ingenious of our Opposers themselves? Briefly, we say, *Mysteries* there are; and it may be such Mysteries, as are even *contradicted by Reason*; that is, are *in some respects* Contradictions to our present (short-sighted and frail) Reason: but when we believe there are some such Mysteries, it is because they appear to our *Senses*; or are proved to us by some such either *Reason* or *Authority*, as no reasonable Man, much less any Number of such Men, does or can deny to be *uncontestable*. And otherways, all the *unwarrantable* Nonsense in the World may be imposed on us, under the Pretence and Cloak of Mystery. But now the Doctrine of the Trinity, hath not only no *uncontestable* Proofs; but the Pretences for it are so feeble, that none of them can be named, but is not only rejected, but *despised* by some of the learnedest of our Opposers themselves. They would persuade us to acknowledg a *Mystery*, full of Contradictions to the clearest *Reason*, and to indisputable *Texts* of Holy Scripture; and supported in the mean time, only by some Texts that may be *interpreted* to a *Rational* Sense, that is, to a Sense that hath nothing contrary either to *Reason*, or to the *unquestionable* Parts or Texts of the Holy Scripture. For Peace sake, we would do so, if it were some light matter that they urged on us: but when the Question is, about one or more Gods, one or more *Divine* Persons, we judg it adviseable, not to be too facile in admitting such dangerous Mysteries; Mysteries that would destroy the Allegiance and Homage that we all owe to the one true God.

I have done, Sir, with the *Explications* of our Opposers. You see what they are:

Dr.

Dr. *S—th*'s Explication is only *an absurd Socinianism*; or Unitarianism disguised in a Metaphysical and Logical *Cant*. Dr. *Wallis* his Explication is *an ingenious Sabellianism*; and in very deed differs from Unitarianism, no more than Dr. *S—th*'s, that is to say, only in the wording. Dr. *Sherlock*'s is such *a flat Tritheism*, that all the Learned of his own Party *confuse* it to be so; and Dr. *S—th* hath written a very accurate Book to *prove* it so. Dr. *Cudworth*'s is *a moderate Arianism*; the *Ariani molles* ascribed as much to the Son, as this Doctor doth; and he denies as much to the Son, as they did; even an *Equality* of Power, and Authority with the Father. Mr. *Hooker*'s is *a Trinity, not of Persons, but of Contradictions*: and he hath advanced such a Son, as of necessity *destroys* his Father. What the *Mystical* Divines teach, cannot be called an *Explication*; they deny all *Explications*: we must say therefore *'tis Samaritanism*; for *what* our Saviour says of the *Samaritans*, by way of Reproof and Blame, *that* these Gentlemen profess concerning themselves, that *they worship they know not what*.

These, Sir, are the Doctrines that we oppose; I shall leave it with you, whether it be without cause.

Before I conclude, I beg your Leave to say two words to Mr. *Bassit*, who hath answer'd (or thinks he has answered) to the *Brief History of the Unitarians*: and to Dr. *Fulwood*, and Dr. *Edwards*, Men of Dignity in the Church; but who have not thought it below them, to use the very vilest Language, and the basest and most ungrounded Scandals, that their Malice to our Persons, and their Ignorance of the Points in question between us and the Church, could suggest to them.

These two Doctors tell their Readers, that the Unitarians deny the *Omniscience* of God, or that he fore-knoweth *contingent* Events: that they deny his *Omnipresence*, making him to be present in all Places, only by his Knowledg, and his Power; that they ascribe the same degree of Power and Knowledg, and pay the self-same Worship to the Lord Christ, whom they affirm to be a meer Man, which they ascribe or pay to Almighty God; and hereby, say these Doctors, they are guilty of an *Idolatry* that is equally *evident* and *abominable*. They pretend to prove this Charge out of the Writings of *Socinus*, *Smalcius*, and some others of the Party. I say now;

1. That their Quotations out of *Socinus* and the rest, are (for a great part of them) as false and disingenious as those of Dr. *Wallis* were: as any one will see, who shall take the Pains to consult the Authors themselves.

2. They make it to be a great Heresy in some Socinians, that they deny there is a *certain* Fore-knowledg of *contingent* Events: they say 'tis a Denial of God's *Omniscience*. And yet all Men know, that very many of the most Learned *Trinitarians*, have been of the same Opinion; Ancients as well as Moderns, Protestants as well as Catholicks. Nor have these Doctors so much as offered at an Answer to the Reasons of *Socinus* and *Crellius*, concerning a *conditional* Knowledg in God.

3. That God is *Omnipresent*, not in his Essence or Person, but by his Knowledg and Power; is also held by divers Learned *Trinitarians*: and it must needs have been the Opinion of those *Fathers*, who either were *Anthropomorphites*; or held that God is a *Body*, not a *Spirit*.

4. These Doctors have written against the Socinians, by occasion of the *English* Books, that have been lately published, by those of that Persuasion: they should therefore have attacked the Doctrine of those Books; they should have described our Opinions out of our own Writings, not from the Books of *Foreigners*. The *English* Socinians sincerely believe, that God is truly *Omniscient*; that he foresecth all Events, how *contingent* soever they may be to us. They believe the real *Omnipresence* of God; or that he is present in his *Essence* or *Person* in all Places, and not only by his Power, Knowledg or Ministers. They honour, or if we must use that word, they *worship* the Lord Christ; neither with the same *sort*, nor with the same *degree* of Worship, which is due to God: they worship or *honour* him, with their Minds, only as one

one who is highly exalted by God, above all Principality and Power, and every Name that is named; and to whom God hath given to be Head over all Things to the Church. In a word, they neither pay a higher Worship, nor impute a greater Power or Knowledge to the Lord Christ, than the most Learned, and the far greater Number of Trinitarians, impute and pay to the Human Nature (the mere Human Nature) of Jesus Christ, in his present State of Exaltation.

We have said these things so often in our late Books; we have defended them so earnestly, that none but Persons of little Honesty, or great Inconsideration, would object to us such Opinions as these before-mentioned. But these Gentlemen had a longing Mind to be Authors; and who should they signalize themselves upon, so popularly, as upon the Socinians; if they have got Reputation by their Books, that is, by weak Arguments and strong Calumnies; it is with so very few, that I do not think they will reap an Advantage by it.

But one of them urgeth, that Socinus was in this dangerous Heresy, that the Soul of Man, after the Death of his Body, is in a State of Inactivity and Unintelligence; in a word, neither perceives nor lives, till the Resurrection of the Body: at which time, it receiveth Immortality, by the meer Grace or Gift of God; but is not, of its own Nature, immortal.

I do acknowledge, that this seems to be the Opinion of F. Socinus; but, I believe, of very few Unitarians besides. But this Error was common to him, with some of the Fathers: the Learned Monsieur Du Pin has noted, that Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Athanasius Fulix and Arnobius were in this Sentiment. There was no Reason therefore to object this, to Socinus; as if it were a peculiar Opinion of his; much less to the English Unitarians, who never defended it; nor, that I know of, do any of them hold it.

As to Mr. Basset, there are two things very remarkable, in his Answer to the Brief History of the Unitarians: the meanes and dulness of the Book it self, it being written with no Vivacity, Wit, or Elevation of Thought; and the undecent Insolence of the Author. His Book being such as it is, if the Brief History cannot shift for it self, against that Reply to it; the Historian is resolved it shall take its Fortune: he is persuaded, that when a discerning Man has read Mr. Basset's Answer; if he again looks over the Brief History, he will (at least) as much approve of it, as at first. Mr. Basset has said nothing, that can in the least shake the Reputation of the Brief History; unless his Reader will believe him, when he charges the Historian with false Quotations of Authors. To this the Historian answers; that he hath not made one false or mistaken Citation: but Mr. Basset sometimes not understanding the Authors that are quoted, for they are Greek and Latin; and sometimes mistaking the Sense of the Historian, which he doth very frequently; it hath happened hereupon, that he hath charged the Historian with his own either Ignorance or Inadvertency. But I am not at leisure to write a Vindication, every time that negligent and ignorant Scribblers mistake my meaning; or the Sense or the Authors by me alledged.

I reckon it to be his Infelicity, that a Person who had nothing to offer on these Questions; but what was very trivial and vulgar; should yet give disrespectful Language, without any the least Provocation given by the Historian. He saith, for instance, that indeed the Foreign Socinians have been learned and subtile Men; but he cannot say so concerning the English: but for the Epistler, so he calls the Writer of the Brief History, because its written in four Letters; he saith, Poor Wretch ought to have imploy'd his small Talent to honester Purposes, and not have sought for Reputation only by his Nonsense, his Folly, and his Impieties.

This was a Mortification indeed, coming (as it does) from so great and worthy a Hand: but the Comfort is, we are apt to be more advised, and better'd also by our Humiliations. And yet I am still of Opinion,

 that

that as Mr. *Basset* thought it requisite to answer the *Brief History* after the great Victory gained over it by Dr. *Sherlock*; so there will not want many others, who will judge it no less than necessary, to give other Answers to it, after this Triumph of Mr. *Basset*. But however that be, I answer to Mr. *Basset*, as *Moses* did to *Pharaoh*, *Glory over me*; I am resolved Mr. *Basset* shall have the *Satisfaction*, that he hath muzzled *the Epistler* for ever. For I will not catch *Flies*, nor spend my Artillery upon *Mud-Walls*, when I happen to meet with such Scarecrows, as Dr. *Sherlock* found up against the Jesuits. Mr. *Basset* may hear from me, and not before.

I will not ask Pardon, Sir, for the length of this Letter; for you see how many it was necessary to make some Answer, but I ought not to forget, to give you my Thanks and Respects, for the *Liberalities* and *Favours*, which you have done to your

Humble Servant.

A LETTER *to the Publisher from another Hand.*

SIR,

I Heartily thank you for the perusal of this most learned and judicious Letter, which I return you; and I congratulate the worthy Author, whom the Divine Wisdom has made an Instrument for the vindicating of his glorious and incommunicable Attribute of Unity, which he has in several Tracts even demonstrated, not only by clear and express Scriptures and obvious Reason, but also now at length from the Confessions of the Trinitarians themselves, the Infringers of it. For what each one condemns the several Explications of the rest, as either inconsistent with the Unity, or the Trinity, they do all in their turns bear Witness to the Unitarians, that their Opposition to the Trinitarian Doctrine is well-grounded and reasonable, and consequently their Doctrine of the Unity the Truth of God. For if each one of their Explications does either introduce the Worship of three Gods, or the Heresy of Sabellianism, as they call it, the turning the Son and Holy Ghost into Names and Operations without any real Distinction of Persons, or Things answering those distinct Names, as it plainly appears they do; then it undeniably follows, there is no such Trinity as they imagine, but a Numerical Unity of Person and Essence in God, as the Unitarians hold; and as some Trinitarians contend in their Opposition one to another. It remains then that the Trinitarian Worshippers, especially the common People, do seriously and in the Fear of the one most High God, consider, what Notions, Conceptions, or Idea's they have, of an Infinite and Almighty Son, and an Infinite and Almighty Holy Ghost distinct from the Almighty Father and Producer of them: For they cannot possibly escape the Condemnation of one of the highest Crimes, even the Worship of three Infinite Real Gods, or two Imaginary Ones, or two Names without Notions; that is, *they know not what*, as this Author expresses it; Condemnation I say, not only by the Unitarians (who worship the Father only as God in the highest and strictest Sense of that Term) but also by all the Trinitarians, that hold not the same Opinion, or have not the same Notion.

I know the Times of Ignorance God winketh at, as well now, as before the preaching of the Gospel; but since he has made his Unity manifest, and vindicated it from the

Scholastick

Scholastick Subtilties and absurd Distinctions, that have been invented to hide the Truth, he then commands all Men, to whom this Evidence comes, to repent. Inconsideration or Negligence will not now excuse. Men must not say or think (as they commonly do) this Point is too high for me to determine; for they have already determined it, whilst they profess to believe in, and to worship three equal ones, a Father, a Son, and a Spirit. Neither can they alledg the Universality of the Trinitarian Faith: For besides (as this Author observes) the worshipping of many Gods was formerly, and is now far more universal; we see that this Opinion and Worship, which soever it be, is condemned by at least four to one of those that go under that common Name of Trinitarians. The rise of these divers and contrary Explications has been this (as is observed by the Author in that which now obtains) that Learned Men looking narrowly into former Explications, have found them inconsistent with the Oneness of God, and therefore have devised somewhat either more obscure, that would hide the Contradiction, or somewhat more consistent with the Unity, tho it destroyes the Trinity; or more consistent with the Trinity, tho it destroys the Unity, as Dr. *Sherlock* has done. And perhaps others like him may devise other Hypotheses, taking it for granted from the Prejudices of early Education and customary thinking, that the Trinity is a Fundamental of Christianity. But we see here they labour in vain to reconcile manifest Contradictions: and in believing the Son and Holy Spirit to be equally God with the Father, they offend against express Scriptures and clear Reason, upon the account of their own Reasonings upon obscure Texts; and therein transgress the plain Principles, both of Natural Light and Revelation, which require, 1. That nothing be held for Truth contrary to evident and Fundamental Truth. And, 2. That obscure Passages are to be interpreted by clear Passages, and the Current of Scripture, and not otherwise. The Jews walking contrary to these Principles, was the cause of rejecting Christ and Christianity, and it is indeed the ground of all Errors whatsoever. In vain do Men pick a great many Texts (that have, even in the Opinion of Learned Trinitarians, another meaning) to prove that the Son and Holy Ghost are God; till they can reconcile that Inference to plain Scripture and evident Reason. In vain does the Author of *The Snare broke* (who could not overcome the Prejudices of his Education and Converse) persuade Men *to lay aside their Philosophy, and wholly to betake themselves to a Scriptural Consideration of the on*, by which I understand, they must take the words of Scripture without understanding them, or reconciling them to other Scriptures, or even the Current of Scripture or common Reason. Do they think that Scripture is to be interpreted contrary to it self? Or, that Divine Wisdom has made the Belief of Contradictions necessary to Salvation?

It seems strange, that Christians should be very zealous in the Punctilio's of the Worship of God, Ceremonies of Posture, Gesture or Apparel, Forms of Addresses to God, the wording of Faith to an Iota; and yet go on in the Worship of one God the Father, and of two distinct from him, God as perfectly as he; and in which their Worship terminates equally with him. They can love God the Father with all their Hearts and Strengths, and two Persons distinct from him, with the same All: they can give all to one, and all to another, and all to a third, and never question the Possibility of it; as if there were a Trinity in Unity in every Man; that his own Heart were three Hearts, to be bestowed all and entirely upon each of three Objects, and yet be but one Heart still. But whither am I carried? This Author needs none of my Notes or Illustrations: and indeed both he and all others that have labour'd in this Controverly, may surcease their Pains henceforth, and leave what they have already said to the Judgment and Conscience of all considerate and sincere Men. I am,

Sir, Your, &c.